

Also, memorial of F. J. McGovern, of Providence, R. I., in favor of making Columbus Day a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OAKLEY: Petitions of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Warehouse Point and Plantsville, Conn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Papers in support of House bill 10190, for pension for Carl O. Nelson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Walter B. Hall and others, of West Warren, Mass., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE: Petition of citizens of Maryland and others, favoring repeal of the seamen's law; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: Petition of sundry citizens of Sigourney, Iowa, against press-muzzle bills of every description; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROWE: Petition of proprietors of Ritz-Carlton Hotel, of New York City, against curtailing mail deliveries in business section of New York; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Central Labor Union of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 6871, relative to convict labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of United Textile Workers of America, favoring passage of House bill 6871, for regulation of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Cigarmakers' Progressive International Union, No. 149, relative to congress of neutral nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Men's Class of Central Presbyterian Church, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of the Smith-Hughes motion-picture commission bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petitions of sundry citizens of Albany, N. Y., favoring censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 10372, to remove the charge of cowardice against John McNeil; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of Hunter Jones, of Asbury Park, N. J., in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, letter from Isaac Stern, favoring embargo on shipment of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Travelers' Protective Association of America, in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of New York Zoological Society, of New York City, indorsing the plan for game sanctuaries in national forests; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Petition of Public Interests League, Women's Antisuffrage Association, Massachusetts, favoring new immigration station at Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, resolution of the New York Zoological Society, of New York, favoring national bird preserves; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions of Albion City Federation of Women's Clubs, of Albion; and Michigan State Federation of Women's Clubs, of Adrian; and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Albion, in favor of Keating child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, protest of Triangle-Film Corporation, New York City, against Hughes-Smith Federal motion-picture censorship bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petitions of Evans & Gishling, Rome, N. Y., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Utica-Willowvale Bleaching Co., the Sanquoit Spinning Co., and the Fort Schuyler Knitting Co., and Foster Bros., of Utica, N. Y., for a tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of First Congregational Church, 300 people; Methodist Episcopal Church, 600 people; and Baptist Church, all of Fruita, Colo.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Meriden Young Men's Christian Association, favoring legislation to prohibit the sale and manufacture of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of 1,710 people of Boulder, Colo., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARD: Petitions of sundry citizens of Hudson, N. Y., favoring censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petitions of International Union and United Brewery Workmen of America and the Central Labor Union, Hudson, N. Y., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry retail liquor dealers of the State of New York, against increase of tax on beer, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of sundry merchants of Des Moines, Iowa, favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 3, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pray Thee to keep us this day from sin. Thou art the God of all power. Thou art the God of grace as well. In the great conflict of life, the stage upon which Thou dost enable us to develop our mental and moral power, we pray that we may have regard for the development of our spiritual life as well, that we may not sin against God. Give to us victory over ourselves that our lives may be open in Thy sight and may be approved of Thee. Guide us this day in the discharge of the duties that are upon us. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, January 31, 1916, when, on request of Mr. VARDAMAN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION OF GASOLINE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair presents a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting, in response to Senate resolution No. 40, certain information as to the production, consumption, and price of gasoline. It is in response to a resolution submitted by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. The Chair does not know to what committee the communication should be referred.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Unless there is some other suggestion made, I suggest that the communication lie on the table temporarily until the Senator from North Dakota arrives.

Mr. GALLINGER. And that it be printed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Let it be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair finds that the communication is accompanied by illustrations, and it will be referred to the Committee on Printing for action.

ARMY DREDGES "ATLANTIC" AND "RARITAN."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, referring to his letter of December 21, 1915, inviting attention to the lack of sufficient water in the ship canals leading to the navy yard, Brooklyn, and conveying the information that the large Army dredges *Atlantic* and *Raritan* are now laid up at the navy yard, New York, on account of lack of funds to proceed with further work, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions filed by the court in the following causes:

John F. Fee v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 306);
Thomas Woods v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 305);
Chris C. Lennet v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 304);
Charles H. Rankins v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 303);
William T. Dwyer v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 302);
Edward G. Grossman v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 301);
James S. Page v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 300);
Wallace N. Evans v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 299);
Walter P. Noonan v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 298);
William Edwards v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 297);
Alfred J. Leigh v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 296);
Henry W. Sims v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 295); and
Henry C. Brock v. The United States (S. Doc. No. 294).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of the German American Alliance, of New Haven, Conn., remonstrating against the seizures of American mail and the suppression of American trade by the British Government, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. THOMPSON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Sabetha, Arcadia, Longton, and Morrill, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against a stamp tax on bank checks, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Buffville, Kans., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Natoma, Kans., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine (for Mr. BURLEIGH) presented a petition of sundry citizens of Houlton, Me., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented petitions of sundry citizens of Texas, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the labor council of Houston, Tex., praying for the printing of the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations, which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. SAULSBURY presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lewes, Del., praying for the enactment of legislation to improve the Lighthouse Service, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. OLIVER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Jamestown, Irwin, Newtown, Warren, Waynesboro, and New Oxford, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of the local unions of the International Union of the United Brewery Workmen of America, in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Farrell and New Castle, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of American Council, No. 47, Daughters of Liberty, of Chester, Pa., and a petition of Council No. 37, Daughters of Liberty, of Marshallton, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of the Society of Friends, of Concordville, Pa., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hampton, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide shorter rural-delivery mail routes, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. HARDING presented memorials of sundry citizens of Ohio, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PHELAN presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Fresno, Cal., remonstrating against the seizure of California fruits destined for delivery to neutral countries, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Medical Association of Oakland, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the Medical Corps of the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Granite Falls, Lake Crystal, Preston, and Blackduck, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Brainerd, Minn., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Crookston, Minn., remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota presented a memorial of the Commercial Club of Huron, S. Dak., remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution of the Dakota Conference of the German Baptist Churches of North America, held at Emery, S. Dak., favoring the placing of an embargo on munitions of war, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the memorial of Levi McGee, of Rapid City, S. Dak., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Huron, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to relieve the congested condition of freight on the eastern seaboard, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. KERN presented a petition of the Columbia Enameling & Stamping Co., of Terre Haute, Ind., praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Muncie, Indianapolis, and Westfield, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Elkhart, Ind., praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 209, International Union of United Brewery Workers, of Richmond, Ind., remonstrating against national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DU PONT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Georgetown, Del., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LIPPITT presented a petition of the Rhode Island Citizens' Historical Association, praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CURTIS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the inspection, grading, and weighing of interstate shipments of grain and hay, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Anderson County, Thomas County, and Sherman County, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Franklin County, Kans., remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Kansas, praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the German-American Alliance, of Leavenworth, Kans., praying for the placing of an embargo on munitions of war, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club, of Topeka, Kans., praying for a readjustment of the compensation allowed railroads for carrying the mail, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. SHIVELY presented a petition of 2,000 citizens of Kokomo, Ind., and a petition of 240 citizens of Elkhart, Ind., praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Afton, N. Y., and a petition of sundry citizens of Hudson, N. Y., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Standard Furniture Co., of Herkimer, N. Y., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented petitions of sundry citizens of Maryland, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Cumberland, Md., praying for the creation of a system of rural credits, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of the District of Columbia, praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SAULSBURY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the bill (S. 4014) to supplement existing legislation relative to the United States Court for China and to

increase the serviceability thereof, reported it without amendments and submitted a report (No. 101) thereon.

Mr. O'GORMAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3606) for the relief of the contributors of the Ellen M. Stone ransom fund, asked to be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, which was agreed to.

Mr. BRANDEGEE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the bill (S. 649) making appropriation for expenses incurred under the treaty of Washington, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 102) thereon.

Mr. HITCHCOCK, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the bill (S. 3680) to authorize the payment of indemnities to the Governments of Austria-Hungary, Greece, and Turkey for injuries inflicted on their nationals during riots occurring in South Omaha, Nebr., February 21, 1909, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 103) thereon.

Mr. CLAPP, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 138) for the relief of the Ottawa Indian Tribe of Blanchard Fork and Rouch de Boeuf, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 104) thereon.

ADJOURNMENT OF DAILY SESSIONS.

Mr. OVERMAN. I report back from the Committee on Rules Senate resolution 88 with a substitute therefor, and recommend that the substitute be passed. I ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the substitute was read and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That so much of the order of December 6, 1915, as fixes the hour of 5 o'clock p. m. as the time of adjournment be, and the same is hereby, abrogated.

COL. JAMES JACKSON.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Military Affairs the bill (S. 1162) to place certain officers of the Army on the retired list, and I submit a report (No. 100) thereon. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon asks for the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. JONES. I suggest that the bill be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Secretary read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and place him on the retired list of the Army with the rank and retired pay of brigadier general, any colonel now on the retired list of the Army who served with credit as an enlisted man and officer of the Regular Army of the United States during the Civil War, who has been brevetted captain, major, and lieutenant colonel, respectively, for gallant services in battles in the Civil War and in actions against Indians, who has been awarded the congressional medal of honor for most distinguished gallantry in action against Indians, and who is now and has been since early in 1904 on active duty.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I state in reference to the bill that it applies only to one officer in the United States Army. He is now past 82 years of age, and from the date of his retirement until now he has been doing and is still doing active service in connection with the Oregon National Guard. He has rendered most efficient service in that respect, as his record discloses he rendered in the Civil War. I have a letter from the War Department reciting the record that this officer has made. In addition to that, Mr. President, I desire to say that he lost an only son about a year ago, a captain in the Army, who was killed in the line of his duty. It has been a great shock to him, and in the very nature of things he can not be with us very long. He is past 82 years old and is still, as I said, engaged in the active service of his country.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator object to giving the name of the officer to whom the bill refers?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Col. James Jackson, now detailed with the Oregon National Guard.

Mr. SMOOT. I think when we pass such legislation the name of the particular officer should be given rather than to state that a certain officer should be retired, as is done in the bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a letter from the Secretary of War which is made a part of the report, and I will ask that it go into the RECORD to show that Col. Jackson is the only officer to whom the bill can apply.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none.

The letter is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT.
Washington, January 5, 1916.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
United States Senate.

SIR: I am in receipt of request that the Senate Committee on Military Affairs be furnished with any information relative to Senate bill 1162 in possession of the War Department.

It is believed that Col. James Jackson, United States Army, retired, is the only officer who has the qualifications necessary to comply with the requirements of the bill. Col. Jackson's military history is as follows:

He served as an enlisted man in the Twelfth Infantry from November 8, 1861, to April 28, 1863, when appointed second lieutenant in the same regiment. He was promoted to be first lieutenant, August 3, 1863; captain, February 17, 1868; major, January 23, 1889; and lieutenant colonel, June 19, 1897. He was retired from active service as lieutenant colonel November 21, 1897, by operation of law, having reached the age of 64 years. He was advanced to the rank of colonel on the retired list under the act of April 23, 1904, by reason of Civil War service. He was brevetted captain August 1, 1864, and major August 18, 1864, for gallant services in the battles of North Anna River and Weldon Railroad, Virginia, respectively, and lieutenant colonel February 27, 1890, for gallant and meritorious services in actions against Indians. He was awarded a medal of honor on April 17, 1896, for most distinguished gallantry in action against hostile Nez Perce Indians at Camas Meadows, Idaho, August 20, 1877.

He was detailed for duty with the Oregon Militia in May, 1904, as a retired officer, and has since then remained on this duty.

Very respectfully,

LINDLEY M. GARRISON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. BRYAN. May I ask the Senator from Oregon to substitute for the bill reported a bill to authorize the President to place this officer on the retired list and to give him this rank? In that form I shall not object to the present consideration of the bill at this time nor to the bill whenever it shall come up, but I do object to the present consideration of a bill using a lot of general language when designed only for the benefit of one officer.

I do this for the reason that it will set a bad precedent. There may be some officers entitled to this unusual distinction; but every officer, whether he comes within the terms of the act or not, will apply for general legislation that would be beneficial to him in a manner similar to this, if not the same that is covered by the general language of the bill as reported by the committee.

I shall therefore object to the consideration of the bill unless the Senator will submit a substitute for the bill as reported providing that this officer shall be given the benefit of this legislation. If that is done, I shall not object.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator will notice the bill, it really does limit the promotion, because it mentions particularly the service of this officer. The letter from the Secretary of War, which is a part of this report, will show that to be the case.

Mr. BRYAN. The evil of this kind of legislation was illustrated by a provision in the naval appropriation act last year. There was language covering two or three pages so drawn as to care for one particular individual. It could not apply to anyone else. I can not see the sense in using a lot of words to accomplish a purpose in a bill that appears to be general, instead of saying directly and specifically and positively and definitely exactly what we mean to do.

In addition to that, as is suggested to me by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], if we desire to give special honor to this officer, it comes with better grace to name him and say he is the man we mean rather than to have general legislation, which will be used as a precedent because obviously, according to its language, it is meant to apply generally.

If I had the name of the officer and knew the exact language to use in order to carry out the purpose, I would move a substitute, giving his name and making him a brigadier general on the retired list.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I withdraw the request and ask that the bill go to the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES—COUNTING A QUORUM.

Mr. NELSON. For the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] I report favorably with an amendment, from the Committee on Rules, Senate resolution No. 7, providing that any Senator upon his own request may be recorded and counted as present in order to constitute a quorum.

Mr. O'GORMAN subsequently said: A moment since the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] reported a resolution from the Committee on Rules. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. WILLIAMS December 7, 1915, and referred to the Committee on Rules, as follows:

Resolved, That the rules of the Senate be amended as follows: In Rule XII, clause 1, after the words "by the Senate," there shall be inserted the following: "and any Senator may arise and declare that he is paired and how he would vote if not paired, and may add that being present he desires to be so recorded, in order to constitute a quorum."

rum; whereupon he shall be so recorded and his presence as a part of the quorum announced by the Chair."

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I object to the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go to the calendar.

REPORTS OF ALASKAN ENGINEERING COMMISSION.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred House concurrent resolution No. 11, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission, in two volumes, for the period from March 12, 1914, to December 31, 1915, inclusive, together with accompanying maps, charts, and profiles, be printed as a House document, and that 6,000 additional copies be printed, of which 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 1,500 copies for the use of the Senate, and 1,500 copies for the use of the commission.

SPECIAL REPORT ON DISEASES OF THE HORSE.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred House concurrent resolution No. 13, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound in cloth 100,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse, the same to be first revised and brought to date under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture; 70,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 30,000 for the use of the Senate.

SPECIAL REPORT ON DISEASES OF CATTLE.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred House concurrent resolution No. 14, reported it favorably without amendment and it was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound in cloth 100,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle, the same to be first revised and brought to date under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, 70,000 copies for use of the House of Representatives and 30,000 copies for use of the Senate.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I notice that reports were made from the Committee on Printing just a moment ago authorizing the printing of 100,000 copies of various worthy publications, and I want to address a question to the chairman of the Committee on Printing [Mr. FLETCHER]. On the 7th of December I introduced a resolution proposing to print 100,000 copies of the final report of the Commission on Industrial Relations. I receive every day requests for copies of that report. I have only one copy. I am certain that every other Senator has received requests for copies, and I should like to ask the Senator from Florida, the chairman of the Committee on Printing, what progress is being made in reference thereto?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will state, Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's inquiry, that the resolution submitted by the Senator called for the printing of the report to which he has referred. A resolution has passed the House, has come to the Senate, and has been referred to the Committee on Printing, calling for the printing of this report. Other resolutions have been submitted calling for the printing of the testimony. We have been considering all these resolutions, but upon investigation we find that the report as submitted by the commission is in the shape of three dry-goods boxes full of material. It has been very difficult to separate the real testimony from certain exhibits, which are regarded perhaps by the commission itself as not a part of the testimony. The committee has been laboring somewhat under the disadvantage of not knowing precisely what was desired to have printed, either by the commission or by the various Members who have submitted resolutions here and in the other body. We shall, however, hold a meeting of the committee on Saturday night. We shall probably then determine the matter and be able to report either in favor of printing the report itself or of printing the report with the testimony, or of printing the report with the testimony confined to certain matter which would not include the exhibits, in the nature of books and publications which have already been printed.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to say to the chairman of the Committee on Printing that I have received a great many requests for the report, but have received no request for the testimony. The requests which have come to me have indicated that what is desired is a large number of copies of the report. That would be much less expensive than to under-

take to print the testimony; and as that seems to be what is desired, I urge the printing of a large number of copies of the report itself.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think there is no disposition at all, I may say, on the part of any member of the committee not to have the report printed; there is, on the contrary, a desire to have printed all that may be wanted, including the testimony, or such portions of it as would not include books already published.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator from Florida that I have had requests similar to those received by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST]. I do not think anybody wants the testimony, but there is almost a universal demand throughout the United States, if I may take the requests that I have received from Mississippi as an index, for this report. I should like very much if the committee would have the report printed in sufficient numbers to meet the demand.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think beyond any doubt the resolution covering the printing of the report will be favorably acted on; but there are other resolutions calling for the printing of the testimony, which, of course, the committee has been obliged to consider.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Florida yield for a question?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. Can the Senator state approximately the amount of matter that would be comprised in the publication if it embraced the entire testimony, together with the exhibits?

Mr. FLETCHER. If it embraced the entire testimony with the exhibits there would be 12 or 14 volumes, and perhaps more.

Mr. ROBINSON. Is the committee making the investigation for the purpose of determining whether or not it is necessary or advisable to print all of that testimony?

Mr. FLETCHER. The committee has been looking into that question with the assistance of the secretary of the commission.

Mr. ROBINSON. I myself have received a great many requests for copies of this report. I do not know whether the requests contemplated copies of the testimony taken by the commission.

Mr. FLETCHER. The commission itself has asked for the printing of a portion of the testimony, but omitting certain exhibits. The committee does not desire to be put in the position of editing the commission's report or excluding any portion of it. At the same time, certain of the exhibits are published books, whole volumes, and it seems to us they can be referred to as, say, "See Exhibit No. so and so," or "See book of such and such a title, published at such and such time," and so forth, without reprinting the book.

Mr. ROBINSON. Does the commission insist upon the reprinting of those books which have been incorporated as exhibits?

Mr. FLETCHER. Apparently that is one difficulty we are having, as to whether the matter reported is an exhibit which has to be reprinted or can be simply referred to. In that case the whole thing would have to be edited.

Mr. ROBINSON. Has an estimate been made as to the cost of printing?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; we have had estimates made. I have not the figures with me right now, but I will say that to print the entire report, including the testimony and all these exhibits, would run into a tremendous sum, exceeding \$100,000, I think.

Mr. ROBINSON. What would it cost to print the report proper without the testimony?

Mr. FLETCHER. To print the report itself, without the testimony, would cost \$7,847.75, embracing 320 pages and furnishing 100,000 copies.

Mr. ROBINSON. The committee has not yet reached the conclusion, then, as to whether or not the whole matter is to be published and printed?

Mr. FLETCHER. Not precisely. We shall determine that at our next meeting, and I think will be able to report by Monday.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. May I ask the Senator from Florida a question?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Did the Senator from Florida say that the Committee on Printing was considering the advisability of printing a part of the testimony?

Mr. FLETCHER. That involves a question of determining what is the testimony. For instance, the testimony may be held, in the ordinary acceptance of the term, as including exhibits.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Assuming that the testimony means what the witnesses said before the Industrial Commission, irre-

spective of the exhibits to which they referred, is the Committee on Printing proposing to print the testimony that was taken before the Industrial Commission?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is one thing the committee is considering; yes. The committee desires to print the testimony without any elimination. The only point is as to printing the testimony instead of printing the exhibits. There are certain volumes, certain published books, which are called exhibits, which the committee feels need not be printed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I understand that. Of course, if I may express an opinion, I should say that it would be absurd to print the exhibits to which witnesses may have referred, and which consist of books, documents, and so forth, that are already in print. I wanted to know whether the committee was really considering the printing of the testimony of the witnesses before the Industrial Commission.

Mr. FLETCHER. The committee is considering that, and one of the resolutions involves that.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. But the committee has not yet been able to decide what constitutes the testimony, as I understand the Senator.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is the case.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Therefore, of course, no estimate has been made as to what would be the cost of printing the testimony?

Mr. FLETCHER. We have estimates as to that also, but the estimates are based upon the printing of the exhibits as well as the testimony; so that the matter is in a rather indefinite shape on that account at present.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Could the Senator, without violating any confidence or committee secrets, advise the Senate what the estimate was as to the printing of the testimony and of the exhibits?

Mr. SMOOT. Two hundred and twenty thousand dollars.

Mr. FLETCHER. One estimate we had, taking in all the data that was submitted, called for an expenditure of about \$220,000.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Only \$220,000?

Mr. FLETCHER. I believe that was the figure.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Is that the lowest estimate?

Mr. FLETCHER. That would include the exhibits as well.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That is one estimate?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Was there any lower estimate than that?

Mr. FLETCHER. If we eliminate the exhibits that are already in print, as the Senator has suggested, that amount will be very materially reduced, of course.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee, perhaps, has not stated as explicitly as he might have done that the members of the late Industrial Relations Commission, or whatever the title of the commission was, have not asked the committee to print the exhibits. On the contrary, they have suggested to the committee that, in their judgment, it was not necessary to print them. There are two or three great dry goods boxes full of books which have been put in as exhibits, and, as the Senator from Connecticut has said, it would look rather absurd to undertake to print those books at the expense of the Government, they being already in print. As I understood, the contention of the members of the commission who appeared before the Printing Committee was that they wanted the final report printed and the actual testimony, the words spoken by the witnesses, but that they would not insist upon the printing of the exhibits. I will ask the Senator if that was not their position?

Mr. FLETCHER. That was their position, I think. As I understand, the Senator states that quite correctly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. This is all out of order, Mr. President, but I will not make the point.

Mr. BORAH. In view of the suggestion made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], I ask has there been any estimate made as to the cost of printing the testimony and the report after the elimination of the matter to which he has referred?

Mr. FLETCHER. That estimate is being looked into now. We will have that estimate by Saturday night. I do not think it has been definitely reported upon.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Florida how many copies are to be printed under the estimate just stated by the Senator?

Mr. FLETCHER. The estimate as to the cost of printing the report is based upon a hundred thousand copies.

Mr. CUMMINS. Including the testimony?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is the report itself. We have not yet obtained a definite estimate as to the cost of printing the testimony, and the number of copies of that we have not yet determined upon.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator think that the printing of the report would be of any great value unless the testimony were printed, so that opportunity might be given to weigh the soundness of the report?

Mr. FLETCHER. I would say that, personally, so far as I am concerned, I would be in favor of printing the testimony and referring in the print to the exhibits without reprinting the exhibits; but the general view seems to be that perhaps the report is all that would likely be read extensively, and that it would probably serve all the purposes of everyone in connection with that work. That is evidenced by the fact that the other body, the House of Representatives, has passed a resolution to print the report, but has said nothing about the testimony. So that I can answer the Senator upon that point by saying that it is quite clearly in the mind of a number of people and of the other body that the printing of the report is all that is required.

Mr. CUMMINS. It seems to me that, if the investigation was warranted at all, those interested in the matter would a great deal rather see the testimony than the report.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the disposition of the committee is to print the testimony, eliminating what might be called a part of it, namely, the exhibits that are already in print.

ANSHE CHESED CONGREGATION, VICKSBURG, MISS.

Mr. THOMPSON. From the Committee on Public Lands, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 4954) directing the Secretary of War to reconvey a parcel of land to the Anshe Chesed Congregation, Vicksburg, Miss., and I submit a report (No. 105) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] to the bill.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill. It will take but a moment to consider it. The Anshe Chesed Congregation of Vicksburg deeded to the Vicksburg National Park 19 acres of land in 1900. It was thought at that time that it would not be needed for cemetery purposes, but since then the Jewish cemetery there has about filled up, and they are asking that the Secretary of War be permitted to deed back to the congregation an acre and a half of this land. The bill has been approved by the Secretary of War and by the president of the Vicksburg National Park Commission. The bill really ought to be passed, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas when the Public Lands Committee passed upon this bill?

Mr. VARDAMAN. It was reported just a moment ago.

Mr. THOMPSON. My recollection is that the committee passed on the bill either yesterday or the day before.

Mr. SMOOT. The Committee on Public Lands have authorized the report of the bill?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMOOT. It must have been at a time when I stepped out of the committee room.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not remember whether the Senator from Utah was present or not. It is a unanimous report, however.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to convey by deed to the Anshe Chesed Congregation, Vicksburg, Miss., a small tract of land for cemetery purposes, which land is now part of the Vicksburg National Military Park, and more particularly described by metes and bounds as follows:

Commencing at the southeast corner of a tract of land as described in deed book C C, page 611, in chancery clerk's office, Warren County, Miss.; thence with an astronomical azimuth 100° and 40' 992 feet to a stone post; then 209° and 10' 509 feet to a stone post; thence 225° and 55' 461 feet to a stone post; thence 220° and 50' 398 feet to a stone post on the south side of the Baldwins Ferry road; thence 296° and 10' 198 feet; thence 355° and 10' 105 feet; thence 23° and 15' 178 feet to the point of beginning.

Thence with an astronomical azimuth 0° and 15' 534 feet; thence 270° and 15' 318 feet; thence 132° and 5' 251 feet; thence 171° and 20' 259 feet; thence 134° and 25' 143 feet to the point of beginning; containing 1.64 acres, more or less, and being part of section 21, township 16, range 4 east: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States in carrying out the provisions of this act.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 4158) granting a pension to Fleming R. Moodie (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SAULSBURY:

A bill (S. 4159) for the relief of the United States Drainage & Irrigation Co.; and

A bill (S. 4160) for the relief of Edward H. Dennison; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4161) granting a pension to Martha Jefferson Crowley;

A bill (S. 4162) granting an increase of pension to John E. Louer;

A bill (S. 4163) granting a pension to Hanna E. Burton;

A bill (S. 4164) granting a pension to Hester Jarman;

A bill (S. 4165) granting a pension to Mary Jane Stewart;

A bill (S. 4166) granting an increase of pension to William H. White;

A bill (S. 4167) granting an increase of pension to David A. Conner;

A bill (S. 4168) granting an increase of pension to Anna L. Cooper;

A bill (S. 4169) granting an increase of pension to Edward P. Payne;

A bill (S. 4170) granting an increase of pension to John R. Megee; and

A bill (S. 4171) granting a pension to Mary Ella McManus; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANDELL:

A bill (S. 4172) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Alphonse Desmare, deceased, and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 4173) granting an increase of pension to Eva Helena Patten; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 4174) authorizing the construction and equipment of an ammunition manufacturing plant at the United States arsenal at Benicia, Cal.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4175) to readjust railway mail pay based on an annual weighing of mail and on space occupied in mail apartment cars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 4176) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain provisions for the care of Federal and Confederate veteran soldiers who served in the War between the States, 1861 to 1865, to enable them to unite in participation of a national reunion and peace jubilee to commemorate the victories and virtues resulting in the half century of peace and prosperity to the American Nation, to be held in the national domain within the Vicksburg National Military Park October 16, 17, 18, and 19, 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 4177) to amend section 8657 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (35 Stat., 65), being act of April 22, 1908, chapter 149, section 1; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 4178) granting an increase of pension to Job D. Marshall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 4179) granting a pension to Martha Hellen Sture (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LIPPITT:

A bill (S. 4180) to correct the military record of Winfield S. Solomon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4181) granting an increase of pension to Mary Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 4182) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Cleavinger (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 4183) granting a pension to Oliver Bryant (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 4184) granting a pension to Maggie Barron;

A bill (S. 4185) granting a pension to Mary Walls;

A bill (S. 4186) granting a pension to Arthur Leland (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4187) granting a pension to William H. Jones (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PAGE:

A bill (S. 4188) granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Raymond (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 4189) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Charles H. Whipple (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

A bill (S. 4190) authorizing the Yankton County Bridge Co., a corporation, to construct and maintain a bridge or bridges and approaches thereto across the Missouri River at a point between Yankton County, S. Dak., and Cedar County, Nebr.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 4191) granting an increase of pension to Adonirum C. Harper (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4192) granting an increase of pension to Parley B. West (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4193) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Campman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 4194) for the relief of the Columbia Finance & Trust Co., of Louisville, Ky., and others (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4195) granting an increase of pension to Ella L. Collett (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4196) granting an increase of pension to David Bethurum (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4197) granting a pension to Burnie M. Rogers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 4198) for the relief of the heirs of Henry B. Strevig, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A bill (S. 4199) granting a pension to Ellen Collins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 4200) granting relief to persons who served in the Military Telegraph Corps of the Army during the Civil War; and

A bill (S. 4201) for the relief of George Fling (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4202) granting a pension to P. H. Dennison (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4203) granting an increase of pension to James W. Mefford (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4204) granting an increase of pension to William Burgess (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4205) granting an increase of pension to Fernandes Sleeth (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4206) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Sherwood (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4207) granting an increase of pension to Lemon M. Stratton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4208) granting an increase of pension to John A. Fike (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4209) granting an increase of pension to Richard Hardesty (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4210) granting an increase of pension to William H. Blackwell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 4211) for the relief of James L. Wallace, his heirs or assigns (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

A bill (S. 4212) for the relief of W. E. Thomas (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4213) granting a pension to Thomas Jefferson Rothgeb (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4214) granting an increase of pension to Hamilton Rogers (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4215) granting an increase of pension to James K. Clear (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4216) granting a pension to Daniel Dye (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4217) granting a pension to Perry Abbott (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4218) granting an increase of pension to Martin Parker (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4219) granting a pension to Zilpha Ann Bush (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4220) granting an increase of pension to Shirley M. Nichols (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4221) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Rowland (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4222) granting an increase of pension to Elcazar L. Miner (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4223) granting a pension to Jennie L. Luppe (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4224) granting an increase of pension to Margaret L. Wood (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4225) granting an increase of pension to John P. Ham (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4226) granting an increase of pension to William H. Harris (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4227) granting an increase of pension to William C. Campbell (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4228) granting an increase of pension to Harry D. Cessna (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:

A bill (S. 4230) authorizing the St. Croix Water Power Co., of Maine, and the Spragues Falls Manufacturing Co. (Ltd.), of Canada, to operate a dam across the St. Croix River at Baileyville, Me. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 4231) granting a pension to Leforest A. Norton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4232) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Cole (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4233) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Low (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4234) granting an increase of pension to Frank Seavey (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4235) granting a pension to Horace A. Gerald (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4236) granting an increase of pension to Edwin E. Lewis (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4237) granting an increase of pension to Charles Harris (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4238) granting a pension to Joseph H. Cote (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine (for Mr. BURLEIGH):

A bill (S. 4239) granting an increase of pension to David F. Pierce; and

A bill (S. 4240) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Stevens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 4241) granting an increase of pension to Louis Badger (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4242) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Miller (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 4243) granting an honorable discharge to William H. Wyman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4244) granting a pension to Thomas J. Boice (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEWLANDS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 96) relating to the removal of the Botanic Garden; to the Committee on the Library.

MILITARY TRAINING.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I introduce a bill to encourage military training. The bill is quite an important measure, which I desire to go to the committee at once, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 4229) to encourage military training was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the 1st day of January, A. D. 1917, no person then under the age of 40 years shall be eligible to appointment in the classified service unless prior to such time such person shall have voluntarily received, under rules and regulations made and published under authority of the Secretary of War, such military training for a period of at least two months as shall be provided for in such rules and regulations. No person shall, after such regulations shall have been published 60 days, be eligible to appointment to the classified service who shall not have become enrolled under said regulations as prepared to take the training thereby prescribed and have agreed to take such training regularly, and, so far as time has permitted, have fulfilled such agreement and complied with such regulations.

Sec. 2. That no one shall hereafter, after such rules and regulations have been published, be examined for appointment in the classified service who shall not have become enrolled as aforesaid, have agreed to take the training provided under such rules and regulations, and have

fulfilled such agreement so far as the intervening time between enrollment under such regulations and date of any examination has permitted; and from and after the 1st day of January, A. D. 1919, no person under the age of 43 years shall be permitted to take an examination for appointment to the classified service or to remain in said service unless such person shall under said regulations have received the training thereby prescribed for military service or its equivalent.

Sec. 3. That no one shall be permitted or qualified to appear as attorney or solicitor in any court of the United States unless for at least one month in each year for and during four years hereafter, or until he shall reach the age of 45 years, he shall have received the military training provided for by such regulations.

Sec. 4. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to prepare and publish regulations enabling persons, under the provisions thereof, to become enrolled for and receive the training prescribed under such regulations; for issuing to such persons certificates that such duty has been duly performed; for excusing persons physically or mentally unfit for such training from taking the same; for substituting in case of women, training for hospital or similar service in lieu of such military training; and providing that those members of the Society of Friends, commonly called Quakers, conscientiously opposed to performing military service which may involve the taking of human life, may in lieu of military training, under such regulations, take such training useful to the Nation in time of war as shall be, by said regulations, prescribed as the useful equivalent thereof.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$650,000 for the purchase of all land on Cushing Island, Portland Harbor, Me., not at present owned in part by the Government, intended to be proposed by him to the fortifications appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$1,000 for the improvement of Madison Street from Fourteenth Street to Colorado Avenue NW., intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

THE JUDICIAL CODE.

Mr. COLT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1412) further to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. RANDELL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 91), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine, or any subcommittee thereof be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fourth Congress, to hold hearings on S. 4086, a bill to provide for the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy and to prevent the spread of leprosy in the United States; to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to pay the expenses of witnesses under limitations provided by law, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY.

Mr. NEWLANDS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 89), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Library, or any subcommittee thereof be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fourth Congress to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. NEWLANDS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 90), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fourth Congress to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I move the reference of Senate joint resolution 91, now on the table, creating a joint subcommittee of the Military and Naval Committees of the Senate and House to investigate national defense, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

THE EUROPEAN WAR.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, it is not very often that I ask to have anything inserted in the RECORD, but I hold in my hand a statement from the Washington Post of January 30. It is not an

editorial. It is a compilation of the figures, according to the best estimates, of the indebtedness incurred and loss in life and disability in the European war. I ask to have it inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY-SEVEN BILLION SIXTY-ONE MILLION DOLLARS IS SPENT IN 18 MONTHS OF WAR; NO DECISIVE BLOW YET—LOSSES IN KILLED, WOUNDED AND PRISONERS SINCE STRUGGLE BEGAN ARE MORE THAN 15,000,000—BANKRUPTCY MENACES GREAT NATIONS ENGAGED IN TERRIBLE STRUGGLE, IN WHICH NEITHER SIDE HAS BEEN ABLE TO GAIN AN ADVANTAGE—TWO BATTLE LINES, 1,950 MILES LONG, ARE DEAD-LOCKED AT EVERY POINT, WITH BELLIGERENT COUNTRIES BLEEDING TO DEATH—ALLIES AND GERMANS, CONFIDENT OF RESULT, REFUSE TO CONSIDER PEACE.

The European war will have lasted 18 months to-morrow—the blackest 18 months known to the modern world.

What has been accomplished?

No European country has been benefited, nor has human liberty advanced at any point, nor has any great moral principle triumphed in any place or on any battlefield.

The net result has been 2,990,000 men in the very prime of life killed, more than 2,200,000 made prisoners, and more than 9,830,000 wounded and maimed, many crippled for life.

BLOODSHED THE HEAVIEST TOLL.

This measureless bloodshed and suffering, making millions widows and many more millions orphans, has been the heaviest toll of the war.

Next the money loss—\$10,862,000,000 borrowed for war by Germany, Austria, and Hungary; \$16,199,000,000 borrowed for war by France, England, Russia, and Italy; a grand total of \$27,061,000,000 spent in making war.

WASTE OF MONEY STUPENDOUS.

The mind can not grasp such stupendous figures or such wastage. It means twenty-seven times the total national debt of the United States, incurred in 139 years of history, including five wars.

It means a sum equal to the entire savings or increase in capital of the entire world for 10 years.

It means a debt of about \$360 for every family in all belligerent countries—more than the total income of a year of every European peasant family or unskilled laborer in Europe.

It means tax burdens for this generation and for generations yet unborn that will make the burdens of life greater than ever before for all.

ECONOMIC CRASH AT HAND.

In short, as Mr. Diamant, the expert in foreign exchange, wrote last week, bankruptcy is so menacing in all the warring countries that "if political economy does not soon make an end of the war the war will make an end of political economy."

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have here an address delivered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] before the Kansas Society of New York City, at the Kansas birthday banquet given on Saturday evening, January 29, 1916. It is a very able address, and I ask that it be incorporated in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I could not hear a word the Senator from Texas said, and I should like to have him repeat the request.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I submitted a copy of an address delivered by the Senator from Kansas last Saturday night before the Kansas Society, of New York City.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator ask that it be printed in the RECORD or printed as a public document?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that it be published in the RECORD.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The address referred to is as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR WILLIAM H. THOMPSON BEFORE THE KANSAS SOCIETY, OF NEW YORK CITY, AT THE KANSAS BIRTHDAY BANQUET GIVEN AT THE WALDORF-ASTORIA, SATURDAY EVENING, JANUARY 29, 1916.

"THE ECONOMIC VALUE OF PROHIBITION."

It is a great pleasure to see so many old Kansans here. It is a high honor to address the Kansas Society of New York City. January 29 is an important date to all Kansans. It marks an important time in my life, because on this day three years ago I was elected to the United States Senate by the Kansas Legislature. It is the birthday of Kansas. Our State is 55 years old—only an infant as time is computed in the life of a State or Nation. Fifty-five years ago to-day the "ship of State" was launched, and Kansas's star first appeared in the far West, announcing to the world the birth of a new State to add new life and power to the greatest Republic on earth. With all her thrilling and glorious history, all her failures and successes, that star still shines and has become the brightest in the constellation of States. The late Eugene F. Ware, Kansas's greatest poet, and who was one of her best and ablest men, in his Rhymes of Ironquill, said:

Of all the States, but three will live in story:
Old Massachusetts with her Plymouth Rock,
And old Virginia with her noble stock,
And sunny Kansas with her woes and glory.

The love of an American citizen for his native State is second only to his love for his country. A great deal has been said during these turbulent times about the lack of patriotism in America, with which I do not agree. I still believe that the American people, individually or collectively, are the most

patriotic people in the world. If it should ever come to a test it would soon be so demonstrated beyond all question of doubt in the minds of the most skeptical. While I know you have great love for your adopted State—New York—yet I am sure you still appreciate the feeling of the fellow who attended a revival meeting in Kansas, and who, when the evangelist got to that part of his sermon where he asked all who desired to go to heaven to stand up, was the only man to remain seated. The evangelist inquired, "What is the matter with you; why don't you want to go to heaven?" He replied, "Kansas is good enough for me."

The subject to which I have been assigned, "The economic value of prohibition," reduced to common everyday English—the language Kansans delight to speak—presents the simple question, Does prohibition in Kansas pay? Unfortunately, the value of most everything nowadays is measured by dollars and cents. If it pays, it is usually pronounced a good thing. If it is a money loser, it is usually pronounced a bad thing. Measured by this standard prohibition is the best thing we have in Kansas. If I were asked what one law results in greatest financial returns and benefits to the people of Kansas, I would answer "the prohibitory liquor law."

The prohibitory amendment was adopted by the people in the general election of 1880. We have, therefore, had over 35 years of prohibition in Kansas. It is true we have not had complete prohibition in actual practice during all that time, for, much to our shame and chagrin, there were many years in which the law was not strenuously enforced. The saloons were closed, but there was no determined effort to do away with "blind tigers" and other liquor joints, particularly in the larger cities, until the crusade of Carrie Nation along about the year 1900. With the forcible use of her little hatchet upon bottles, mirrors, and bars, and frequently upon the head of a joint keeper, she soon made the life of the "jointist" miserable. She proclaimed the doctrine that it was not unlawful to strike down an unlawful business, even if you had to resort to unlawful means. Whatever criticism may be made of her unlawful method of destroying an unlawful business, yet her strenuous work resulted in great good by calling direct attention of the people to the open and defiant violation of the law, which they had theretofore thought impossible to remedy. The issue was at once raised as to whether these violators of the constitution and the laws of the State were greater than the State itself. This so enraged the people that they demanded action on the part of public officials who had been in the habit, more or less, of winking at the unlawful business, and soon thereafter the liquor laws were enforced everywhere. For the last 10 or 12 years, even in the larger cities, there has not been a saloon, joint, blind tiger, speak-easy, drug store, or any other place generally known to the public where intoxicating liquors have been sold. We have, therefore, for the last decade had complete prohibition everywhere in the State. As we review the past it will be observed that the more strenuously we enforced the law the greater has been our prosperity.

January 1, 1916, we paid off the last dollar of indebtedness against the State. Only five other States in the Union have been financially able to do this. In 1880 when the prohibitory amendment was adopted the bonded indebtedness of the State amounted to \$1,881,975. In 1903 it was still \$632,000. About this time we commenced the vigorous and determined enforcement of the prohibitory law. We made the first payment of \$18,000 on this principal in December, 1908, and the last payment of \$159,000 on January 1, 1916. Thus in about seven years of complete prohibition we paid this entire debt.

But the payment of the State's indebtedness does not mark the greatest economic value of prohibition. We have gradually increased in material wealth upon every hand until we have become the wealthiest State in the Union per capita. We have increased in wealth in the past 10 years, during complete prohibition, at the rate of \$120,000,000 per year. Our per capita wealth is \$1,630, being twice that of the Nation. We have nearly \$3,000,000,000 of taxable wealth, requiring only the low-tax levy of \$1.25 per thousand—lower than the tax rate of any other State in the Union, except one. The State owns various public institutions valued at \$21,500,000. It has a permanent school fund of \$10,485,299. It has invested in its school property more than \$28,000,000.

We spent last year \$12,210,000 for educational purposes. We have enrolled in our colleges 27,000 students—the largest college attendance in proportion to population of any State of the Union. We point with pride to the fact that we have less than 2 per cent of illiteracy—next to the lowest of any State in the Union. Since 1880, during the 35 years of prohibition, the illiteracy of our people has been reduced from 49 per cent to less than 2 per cent.

Kansas municipal bonds are as salable as any other municipal bonds anywhere in the Union and at as low a rate of interest, and at least one-half of these bonds are now owned by Kansas people and \$10,000,000 of such bonds are held by the State school funds. So if any of our friends here on Wall Street own Kansas municipal bonds and want to sell them they can easily do so at a premium at any time. They at least need not hesitate to purchase them at a reasonable rate, for they can find no better investment anywhere. The brewery interests of the country spend much time and money in endeavoring to demonstrate by the juggling of figures that Kansas is fast on the road to bankruptcy. But regardless of what they contend, when it comes to investing their own money you will find they have purchased and hold all the Kansas securities they are able to secure. They understand better than anyone else that people who do not spend their money for liquors have plenty of money to pay their debts when they become due, and that they can depend upon any obligations they make being paid.

This is not the only way in which the wealth of the State is shown, much of which results from prohibition. We have about 1,700,000 people. These people have cash on deposit in the State and National banks to the amount of about \$225,000,000, being \$132 in cash on hand for every man, woman, and child in the State—a greater amount per capita than can be shown by any other State in the Union.

In addition to this, we have helped build up one of the largest and most prosperous cities in the United States on our border at the mouth of the Kaw. While about one-third of this great city—Kansas City—is on the Kansas side of the line and we receive the advantage of its wealth and deposits, yet Kansas has furnished, and is now furnishing, fully 50 per cent of the banking and other business of Kansas City, Mo. Most every bank in Kansas carries a balance in Kansas City, Mo., and these deposits are added to the deposits of Missouri. If we received the benefit of the actual money belonging to the Kansas banks and Kansas people in Missouri, we could point to \$500,000,000 deposits for the Sunflower State.

We have about 75,000 automobiles in the State, being 1 car to every fifth family, enough to take every man, woman, and child living in our State an auto ride of 25 miles every day in the year. We have 340,000 telephones—sufficient to supply a telephone for every family of five—the largest percentage of any State.

We have a lower death rate than any other State in the Nation. Of course, people who have more fun at a funeral than anywhere else may not think this a blessing. It is in the Two Orphans, where the boys were forbidden to go to the funeral of a neighbor whom their parents did not like, when one of them remonstrated: "Pa never did want us boys to have any fun." While some people may not think the low death rate an advantage, yet if you do not have too many enemies, it is a point worth considering.

There are no idle men in Kansas. Anybody who really wants work can always find it. There are very few farmers or merchants who really have enough help, and they are unable to get it. There is only one pauper to every 3,000 population, and there are 38 county poor farms which have no inmates, and many counties which have no poor farms at all and have no need for them. We have a half million boys and girls in the State who have never seen a saloon. I have a boy 16 and a girl 18 who had never seen a saloon until we went to Washington. What a sad commentary upon the Capital of our Nation. But this will not exist for long. The Capital of the Nation is soon to be dry, and decisive steps in that direction will be taken by the present Congress.

In addition to all this existing wealth, Kansas coins more wealth every year at the rate of about \$650,000,000 from farm products and live stock. In 1915 these items aggregated \$652,217,081, and our manufacturing products amounted to \$325,000,000. This great production would enable our State alone to pay the entire appropriation for the Army, Navy, and coast defenses necessary for the protection of our country from war and still have plenty of money left for our people. It would, therefore, seem that if one State in the Union alone is able to pay for all the necessary preparation for defense, which we hear so much about every day, the preparedness program of President Wilson can not be regarded as unreasonable when we have the whole Nation to draw upon. If by the appropriation of an additional \$75,000,000 or \$100,000,000 per year for a short time now we can safely protect the honor and integrity of the Nation and insure our country against war, it will certainly be better than running the risk of war and of spending billions later on. If war should come, this country would not hesitate, and, in my judgment, would be required, to expend \$100,000,000 every day

the war continued. There is a great difference between preparation for defense to preserve peace and preparation for war. No sane American citizen wants war. Whatever this administration does toward preparedness will be in the interest of preserving peace.

We have in Kansas a sober, industrious, law-abiding, and patriotic people. With such a people, and health, wealth, and prosperity upon every hand, nothing but happiness can result. Kansas does not take second place to any of her sister States in happiness, prosperity, and intelligent citizenship. Kansas prosperity is not mythical; it is real. Kansas property is tangible. It is not made up simply of an aggregation or multiplication of figures and statistics, but you can put your fingers on it. The boys and girls who grow up in the Sunflower State under such moral, healthful, and physical surroundings rapidly forge to the front and outstrip their less fortunate brothers in the rough and tumble struggle of life. Pure minds, strong bodies, stout hearts, and a determination and grit that can not be subdued, tell the story. Our sons are at the top in every great city, from Chicago, in the North, to New Orleans, in the South; from San Francisco, in the West, to New York City, in the East. I congratulate you upon your preferment here.

While prohibition is not the sole cause of all these great blessings, yet it is fair to say that it has contributed largely and, I think, more than any other one factor, to bringing it about. There is one thing sure, and that is that 90 per cent of the people of Kansas are satisfied with it. At the last general election the resubmission proposition received less than 10 per cent of the votes of the people. It is a reform in Kansas that is here to stay, and is a reform gradually growing everywhere, until within another decade it will sweep the entire country, this great city of New York included.

With the millions of dollars unnecessarily expended for intoxicating liquor every year over the country devoted to useful purposes, the time will come when there will not be want anywhere, and the people now homeless and in starving and suffering condition will own their own homes and there will be plenty for everybody. Sixty-four and eight-tenths per cent of the homes owned by the people of Kansas are free from incumbrance, while in license States like New Jersey only 43.3 per cent of the homes are owned free. In a country like this, with the greatest wealth and resources of any nation in the world, there is something wrong when there is a single man, woman, or child anywhere in the land suffering for any necessity. Eradicate the liquor traffic, and you have struck down the worst evil in the country, and have taken a step that will tend more than anything else to bring about comfort, prosperity, patriotism, and happiness everywhere.

MOUNT KEARSARGE AND MOUNT PEQUAWKET, N. H. (S. DOC. NO. 307).

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed as a document the statement compiled by David M. Hildreth, topographer, Post Office Department, and member of the United States Geographic Board, being historical notes relating to the conflicting names of two mountains in the State of New Hampshire. It is a matter of consequence to the people of my State, and as the statement is brief, I ask that it be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that 1,000 additional copies of the statement be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

"BACK TO THE CONSTITUTION" (S. DOC. NO. 308).

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have an article which is a reprint from volume 3 of the Virginia Law Review, entitled "Back to the Constitution," written by Judge Walter Clark, chief justice of the Supreme Court of North Carolina. I ask that it be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SUGAR STATISTICS (S. DOC. NO. 309).

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I desire to have printed as a public document a pamphlet of five and a half pages, being statistics relating to the Hawaiian sugar industry, compiled by the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMPROVEMENT OF ROADS.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, if there is no other order of business, I desire to make a motion. I have been instructed by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to move that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the consideration of House bill 7617, to provide that in order to promote agriculture, afford better facilities for rural transportation and marketing farm

products, and encourage the development of a general system of improved highways, the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall in certain cases aid the States in the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads which may be used in the transportation of interstate commerce, military supplies, or postal matter, and that it be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

I understand that this is rather a delicate matter; but the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads have always, so far as I know, had charge of this subject—the building, construction, and maintenance of post roads. The committee have reported one or two bills on this subject, and they feel that they ought to have charge of and the consideration of this bill. It is a very important one. It is a matter that has been recommended in our national platforms by both parties for four and eight years. It seems to me that the time has come when there ought to be some action on the subject, and that that action ought to come from the committee naturally having charge of the subject.

The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. GORE] is absent, and I understand will be away for three weeks or more. The second member of that committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], also a member of the Post Office Committee, believes that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads ought to have jurisdiction of this subject, and that they ought to be permitted, as has heretofore been the case, to consider and report a bill.

I have nothing further to say, except that I think—

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a minute?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. During the last Congress a House bill on this same subject was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads; was it not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, in view of the absence of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], I believe we ought not to dispose of the matter finally to-day. I am not sure that he would object, but I think there ought to be an opportunity to communicate with him. The rule provides that the matter may go over on the request of a single Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Before objection is made, I should like to say a few words.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I will say to him that unless the Senator from Oklahoma, the chairman of the committee, has changed his mind since yesterday afternoon, he will object to it, and seriously object.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I thought it was best to allow his clerks an opportunity to communicate with him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is an objection, is there?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. No; not at present. I think the Senator from Georgia desires to be heard.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to say a word or two in reply to the views expressed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

We have in the Agricultural Department a Good Roads Bureau. We have in the Agricultural Department an organization devoted to the study of good roads, engaged in going out and giving aid in the construction of good roads. Any appropriations that have heretofore been made by Congress looking toward the improvement of roads have been administered under the Agricultural Department.

It is true that some of these bills have been referred heretofore to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and some of them have been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which this bill has been heretofore referred, has had the bill under consideration. The committee has gone over it. It has taken up certain other bills that have been introduced upon this subject, and has been studying amendments to the House bill with a view of perfecting it. The House bill has for its title "to promote agriculture, afford better facilities for rural transportation and marketing farm products, and encourage the development of a general system of improved highways." It provides that the Secretary of Agriculture, on the part of the United States, shall in certain cases aid the States in the construction and maintenance of the roads which may be used in the transportation, and so forth.

Mr. BRYAN. The transportation of what?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It says, "the transportation of interstate commerce, military supplies, and postal matters," but the Secretary of Agriculture is to administer the bill. The whole purpose of the bill is, under the Department of Agriculture, to do certain work.

So far as I am personally concerned, I do not care which committee has the bill, except that I feel that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is very favorable to some such legislation. I believe we will have a favorable report from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I know that at the last Congress we had an unfavorable report from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. I wish the Senate understood the situation.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRYAN. On the contrary, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads reported a bill at the last session of Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; it reported a bill which we knew could not pass. It reported the Bourne bill, which involved an expenditure of \$500,000,000—was it not—in the nature of a bond issue.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Did not that look liberal enough?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; but the bill made no progress here at all. It died as a result of the report.

I only wish the Senate to understand the status of the matter, so that when the vote is had we may vote intelligently upon the subject. If I felt confident that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads would report this House bill with proper amendments favorably, and give us an opportunity to pass it, it would be just as satisfactory to me for it to be there as with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Of course I may be mistaken. I hope, if it goes to the Post Office Committee, that a favorable report will be presented.

Mr. TOWNSEND rose.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has had the bill before it, and has been at work upon it, and the members agreed to take certain other bills and study them and bring in suggestions of amendments, and we were to hold another meeting in the near future to act on the bill. If we leave the bill before the Committee on Agriculture we may expect a speedy report favorable to the House bill with, perhaps, some amendments. I had intended to do what the Senator from Arkansas intended to do, make the point as to the time of consideration; but I will not make it until the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] makes any remarks that he wishes to make.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has disclosed the purpose which was in the view of some members of the committee in having this bill referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry instead of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. If that is a proper reference, if the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads is not to have anything to do with the subject of post roads, we had better amend the title of the committee.

The Senator from Georgia says that he wants this bill to come to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry because the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads is not in favor of the sort of bill he wants to have enacted.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I did not go that far. I said I feared it was not. I said I preferred to have it stay before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry because I was confident it was favorable. I would not undertake to say what the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads would do. I hope, if the bill remains there, that we will have a favorable report.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, this bill, as indicated by its title, after it gets through the compliment to the Secretary of Agriculture, states that the purpose of it is to establish roads for the transportation of interstate commerce, military supplies, and postal matter. In 1912, in the consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill, the Senate was called upon to consider an item which came from the House in the House bill to establish post roads. The Senate at that time was not able to agree to the plan outlined in the House bill, and instead of passing any legislation at all upon the subject this provision was inserted in the House bill and agreed to in conference:

That a joint committee shall be appointed, composed of five Members of the Senate, to be designated by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and five Members of the House, to be designated by the chairman of the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, to make inquiry into the subject of Federal aid in the construction of post roads and report—

And so forth.

In pursuance of that legislation a joint committee was created. At that time the then Senator from Oregon, Mr. Bourne, was chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. He designated the four other Members of the Senate. Likewise five Members were designated from the House. That commission of the two Houses of Congress began to investigate this subject in order to start right in lending the aid of the

Federal Government to the States in the building and maintenance of good roads.

The term of office of the Senator from Oregon expired, but because of his interest in the subject he remained at Washington through the Sixty-third Congress. Being chairman of that joint commission, he devoted much time and study to this subject; and as the result of that investigation a report was made to Congress that is conceded to be the ablest discussion of the whole subject of good roads that has ever been had.

At the last session of Congress a bill came over from the House of Representatives. It never occurred to a single individual in the Senate to move or suggest that that bill dealing with post roads should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It went, as naturally it should have gone, to the committee established for the purpose of considering post roads. Why, Mr. President, under the Constitution, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was the only committee that would naturally have a right to this bill. The Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was not in sympathy with the kind of legislation the House of Representatives wanted, and instead of reporting favorably the House bill the Senate committee substituted, with a few minor changes, the bill recommended by the joint commission appointed by Congress to investigate this subject.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, he is entirely mistaken. The joint committee never recommended the Bourne bill. In fact, it made no recommendation for any bill. As an individual report of Mr. Bourne—

Mr. BRYAN. Let us see whether it did or not, Mr. President.

Mr. SWANSON. I signed the report; the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] signed the report.

Mr. BRYAN. Senator Bourne says they did, and here is what the Senator from Virginia had to say at that time.

Mr. SWANSON. The report has been published.

Mr. BRYAN. Yes; I will read it. (Reading:)

DECEMBER 31, 1914.

Hon. JONATHAN BOURNE, JR.,

Chairman Joint Committee on Federal Aid in the Construction of Post Roads, United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: We have read the report submitted to us by you, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Federal Aid in the Construction of Post Roads, for our consideration, and we take this opportunity of expressing our approval of the report, with the exception of some parts of chapter 2.

Now, Mr. President, chapter 2 does not deal with the subject, except that in that chapter Senator Bourne proceeded to criticize the activity of some of the executive departments. That is all chapter 2 dealt with. Then this letter proceeds:

The great work you have accomplished in such short time is remarkable, and we think the committee owes you a vote of thanks for your unselfish and untiring devotion in preparing this work for the committee. It will undoubtedly be a great textbook on the subject of good roads.

We, as members of the committee, thank you and appreciate the splendid services you have rendered the committee as its chairman.

Very truly, yours,

CLAUDE A. SWANSON.
LEE S. OVERMAN.

In the body of this it says:

We take this opportunity of expressing our approval of the report, with the exception of some parts of chapter 2.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

Mr. BRYAN. Just a minute. That criticizes what Senator Bourne considered was a grasping after power by the heads of executive departments.

I do not know whether the Senator meant by that language to say he approved of the report otherwise than that, but it leads me to that conclusion.

Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads has devoted four years to a study of this subject. It is a subject that deals with post roads. It was a sharp trick to have a bill referred to a committee that was thought to be favorable to the House bill.

I will say in passing that whichever committee keeps jurisdiction of this bill, whenever it is considered in the Senate the Senate will have an opportunity and will be given the opportunity to compare the merits of the Bourne plan with the merits of this bill. This proposition—

Mr. OVERMAN. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Did Senator Bourne in his general report recommend the passage of that bill? Does he not recommend it only as an individual?

Mr. BRYAN. He makes the report and the Senator from North Carolina agrees to his report.

Mr. OVERMAN. He made a very valuable report, all of which I agreed to with that exception, but in that report he does not, I understand, recommend the bill.

Mr. BRYAN. The bill that came from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads at the last session embodying the

ideas of the bill reported by the joint commission I myself introduced at the request of the chairman of the joint commission. The committee changed it in some respects. It reduced the amount of bonds to be issued. It struck out the provision that would establish a college for mechanical and electrical engineers and for road engineers. We struck out that provision. These were some things we did do, but it can not be argued that it was not in essence and substance the proposition recommended by the joint commission.

Indeed, the Senator from Georgia very frankly says that his objection to its going to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was because he was afraid that committee would come in here again recommending the Bourne plan. I do not know whether they will or not. I hope they will recommend it, but whether they do or not the Senate has control of the bill when it gets here.

This committee is entitled to have the bill referred to it and make its report upon it. If it is not to deal with the subject of post roads, then we had better strike out of the title of the committee the words "and Post Roads."

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator from Florida yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am not very familiar with the rules and precedents and practices of the Senate, having been here only a short time, but I want to know whether bills in this body are referred to a committee because of appropriateness or whether bills are referred to one committee because it is thought they will recommend it, or to another committee because it is thought they are against it and they want to kill it.

Mr. BRYAN. When such bills have been here before they have always been referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, until it was demonstrated at the last session of Congress that the Senate committee, and I believe the Senate, was not in sympathy with the sort of plan worked out by the House of Representatives; and it now occurs to some gentlemen to rob the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the consideration of the subject and give it over to a committee which has no jurisdiction of the question. You might as well refer this bill to the Committee on Revolutionary Claims, which has not had a meeting for a half century or so, and would like to have some business to dispose of.

Mr. President, I am surprised that even a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would object to this bill going to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. That committee has always had jurisdiction of the question, and the only reason for a reference to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, the Senator fears, will not recommend the sort of legislation he would like to see enacted.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is absolutely mistaken as to the Bourne bill being indorsed either by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] or myself, who were members of the commission who investigated Federal aid to public roads. We had repeated meetings, at which Mr. Bourne endeavored to get the joint commission to indorse his bill. After repeated meetings we suggested a report that we would agree on, which is not the Bourne bill, but simply carrying out principles. Mr. Bourne prepared that report in accordance with what was voted on at the meeting of the joint commission. He then might have made an individual report, not as chairman of the commission but giving his own views in reference to the Bourne bill. What was indorsed by members of the commission is the report as chairman, which did not approve the Bourne bill, which purposes to sell a billion dollars of bonds issued by the Federal Government, with State bonds furnished as security.

The Senator from Florida is entirely mistaken, and if he will read the report made by Mr. Bourne as chairman of the commission, and not his individual report, he will find that he has entirely misconceived the letter of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] and myself.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President—

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. BRYAN. Let me ask the Senator why he did not draw a distinction between the individual views of Senator Bourne and the views of the chairman of the commission in his letter of indorsement of his report?

Mr. SWANSON. The letter of indorsement distinctly states your report as chairman of the commission. He brought the report here and he could not have it printed until he got a majority of the commission to approve the printing of it as a report.

Mr. BRYAN. What part is it that the Senator objected to?

Mr. SWANSON. I objected entirely to the Bourne plan as contained in it.

Mr. BRYAN. Did the Senator object to any part except chapter 2?

Mr. SWANSON. To chapter 2, the portion that criticizes the administration of executive officers.

Mr. BRYAN. Then, if the Senator objected to the other chapters, why did he not say so?

Mr. SWANSON. The Bourne bill is not indorsed in the report of the chairman. Can not the Senator from Florida understand the difference between a report made by the chairman of the joint commission and a report made by an individual member of the commission? What was said in behalf of the Bourne bill was said on the individual responsibility of Mr. Bourne. What he reported as chairman was voted upon and indorsed by the members of the commission. If the Senator will look at the report he will see that the Bourne bill was never indorsed by the commission.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I have read every word of the report two or three times and I am very familiar with it. I have always understood that the joint commission, acting through Senator Bourne, submitted the result of its investigations and a report in favor of a plan allowing a State to issue bonds at 4 per cent on the credit of the United States, the Government to issue its bonds at 3 per cent, the 1 per cent difference to be compounded annually. The commission estimated that that in 50 years at compound interest would reach an amount which would pay the principal, and the bonds would be canceled.

I do not know what the Senator from Virginia did with reference to the report except what the Senator said he did at the time, and all the objection the Senator raised was because in this report chapter 2 criticizes the turning over of the affairs of the Government to the heads of executive departments.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator is entirely mistaken. If that is his view, he has never read the report carefully. He has never read it if that is what he believes there is in it. Not one member of the commission, as I remember, favored the Bourne bill. They refused to indorse it. They made a report as to the necessity of good roads and as to the cost, and discussed general principles, and that is all the commission agreed on. They could not agree on a bill, because Mr. Bourne would not agree on anything else except the Bourne bill. Not another member of the commission, I think, favored it except Mr. Bourne. What the Senator has read is what Senator Bourne tried to get the commission to indorse and they refused, and are his views as an individual.

Mr. BRYAN. Did he have more influence with the commission in framing the report than the other nine members of the commission? Why did not the Senator from Virginia file a report?

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will allow me, we tried to reach an agreement on all matters we could agree on, to have as much agreement as possible. If my recollection is right, we had a joint session and we decided all things we could agree on, but not on the Bourne bill, and we directed the chairman of the commission to draw a report in accordance with what we had agreed on. He drew a report and the report he drew, with the exception stated, he reported as chairman, not as an individual, was approved by the Senator from North Carolina and myself. It does not contain the remotest indorsement of the Bourne bill. I understand there was but one member there who favored it, and he reserved the right to make an individual report. If the Senator read about the Bourne bill, it was the individual views of Senator Bourne as an individual member and not as chairman. Now, that is clear, and all the Senator has to do to ascertain it is to read the proceedings.

Mr. BRYAN. What part of the report does the Senator indorse?

Mr. SWANSON. I indorse the report he made as chairman, that he was directed to make by a majority of the commission, not as an individual.

Mr. BRYAN. What part is that?

Mr. SWANSON. It is here.

Mr. BRYAN. What is that?

Mr. SWANSON. It just discussed general principles that ought to be followed and does not approve the Bourne bill.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I am interested in the disagreement between the two Senators. I want to ask the Senator from Virginia if there is in the document which has been read any report signed by Senator Bourne as chairman of the commission?

Mr. SWANSON. I think he reserved the right to make a report as an individual. I do not know whether he submitted it or not. He brought his report here as chairman. It was made in pursuance of an agreement between the three members on

the part of the Senate. The report of the chairman has been indorsed, with the exception of a certain section in reference to its execution.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I understand that statement; but it seems to me the only way for those of us who are not familiar with the proceedings of that commission to find exactly what the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from North Carolina indorsed would be to have some notion of the report that they indorsed.

Mr. SWANSON. The report is filed here.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I would ask the Senator what portion of the report did he except from his approval of that particular report?

Mr. SWANSON. The portion in connection with the reflection on the executive departments of the Government and their uselessness in enforcing it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. That also appears in the report of the chairman?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes; and the report was approved with that exception. Then, as an individual, he reserved the right to make a report. I do not know whether he filed that report or not.

Mr. BRYAN. There is no individual report shown here. I get my information only from the body of the document.

Mr. SWANSON. Let the Senator get the report of the chairman. That is not the report. That is the evidence and all.

Mr. BRYAN. No, sir; this is the report.

Mr. SWANSON. There is nothing here.

Mr. BRYAN. This is all the report in evidence here.

Mr. SWANSON. There is nothing there.

Mr. BRYAN. It is the Report of the Joint Commission on Federal Aid for the Construction of Post Roads.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to have the Senator find a report made by Mr. Bourne as chairman of the commission that indorsed the Bourne bill. Let the Senator find it. The Senator said that he has read it. Now, let him find it.

Mr. BRYAN. Here is the letter signed by the chairman.

Mr. SWANSON. Find the report.

Mr. BRYAN. This is a part of the report.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator has stated that that report indorsed the Bourne bill. Now, find the portion of the report that indorses it.

Mr. BRYAN. I will do it right now.

MY DEAR SIR: We have read the report submitted to us by you, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Federal Aid in the Construction of Post Roads, for our consideration, and we take this opportunity of expressing our approval of the report, with the exception of some parts of chapter 2.

Mr. SWANSON. Now, let the Senator find where the report recommends the Bourne bill.

Mr. BRYAN. The Bourne bill is not there.

Mr. SWANSON. No; it is not in the report that we approved. Find the Bourne bill. It is not here.

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator from Virginia said he approved all except chapter 2. I do not know—

Mr. SWANSON. What was submitted to me did not contain any approval or recommendation of the Bourne bill. There is no part of it that recommends it. The Senator can not find it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Will the Senator yield to me just a moment?

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator can not find it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Did the report the Senator refers to as the report of the chairman of the commission contain chapter 2?

Mr. SWANSON. It contained chapter 2. Here is the report.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. But the Senator has just said that that is not the report.

Mr. SWANSON. The report contains what is done in Russia, what is done in France, what is done in England, what is done in various States. It gives the evidence, and then it contains the recommendation. The recommendation does not approve or recommend the passage of the Bourne bill.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Then, will the Senator please read chapter 2 of the report to which he has just referred which does not recommend the passage of the bill?

Mr. SWANSON. It would take about two days to read the report.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. No; I am thoroughly serious. The Senator says there were two reports and two statements, one made by Senator Bourne as an individual and the other made by Senator Bourne as chairman of the commission. Now, he says in his letter to Senator Bourne that he approved of all parts of his report except chapter 2. I should like to have the Senator call our attention to what chapter 2 is to which he objected in the report of the chairman of the commission.

Mr. SWANSON. It is on the desirability of Congress to control. Senator Bourne desired that the improvement of public roads should be controlled, as I understand it, by a joint committee of the House and Senate. That was contained in his report, and we objected to any joint control by the House and Senate in improving roads.

If the Senator will permit me, this report contains every bill that has been introduced in the House and Senate, and all the laws of all the different States. It has the Shackelford bill in it and the Bourne bill, but none of them were approved. No recommendation was made as to the adoption of any bill because the commission could not jointly agree on a plan to submit to Congress. If the Senator from Florida will read it, he will find that all the bills were not approved. No recommendation was made of the Bourne bill any more than of the Shackelford bill, and the joint commission made no recommendation for the Shackelford bill.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President—

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Bourne reserved the right to make an individual report. Whether he filed that report or had it printed I do not know, but I recall that he reserved the right to make a report as an individual member of the commission.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I must be very obtuse, but I understand that the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from North Carolina agreed with some report made by the commission with certain reservations. Is that correct?

Mr. SWANSON. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Now, I am trying to get at what the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from North Carolina did agree to and did believe was a good thing.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will listen, we agreed to certain principles. First, that there ought to be Federal aid. We agreed as to the necessity and importance of it. We agreed to report as to what it would cost generally throughout the country, upon investigations as to the cost of carrying products overland per ton on bad roads. When we came to fix up a specific bill as to whether it should be the Bourne bill, the Shackelford bill, the Overman bill, or the Swanson bill or any bill, no conclusion was reached. No recommendation was made for a specific bill, and the report recommends no particular bill.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I know; but what I am trying to get at is, where is the published thing?

Mr. SWANSON. Here it is [exhibiting].

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Well, does the Senator agree with all that?

Mr. SWANSON. We agree with all that, except chapter 2; that is, the report portion of it. If the Senator will permit me, evidence was brought in, facts were brought in, letters were brought in—and it is an accumulation of what was before us without a recommendation of any bill.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I understand that lots of things went on before the committee, all of which are included within the leaves of that publication?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. But did the Senator mean, in the letter which he and the Senator from North Carolina signed, that they agreed to all of the things contained there, except the specific chapter 2?

Mr. OVERMAN. We agreed to just what the letter says.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I can not find what the letter says. That is what I am trying to get some information about.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will take the report before him, he can ascertain very definitely what was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. But the Senator says that was not the report.

Mr. SWANSON. No, I did not. I said it was not the recommendation of the report.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SWANSON. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, it seems to me this discussion has wandered far afield. The question is whether or not this bill ought to go to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. I should like to hear the Senator from Virginia discuss that. We are not discussing the merits of any particular bill—that is, such a discussion is not in order at this time. It is a question of whether or not the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads is the proper committee to consider legislation of this character.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, I simply rose as a matter of personal privilege on that phase of the matter, to state that the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] was mistaken when he stated that he had the impression that I had ever in-

dorsed by any method, by a report of otherwise, a recommendation for the passage of the Bourne bill.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President—

Mr. VARDAMAN. I suggest that that ought to be declared a draw.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to make a suggestion, I will say that I did not mention his attitude. He flung that in.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, he read the letter of the Senator from North Carolina and myself and tried to impress on the Senate that that letter conveyed an approval of the Bourne bill, which was not included in the recommendation of the report.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President—

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator did not do so, that is all right.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. OVERMAN. I stand by the letter.

Mr. BRYAN. I had not mentioned the rather remarkable position of the Senator from Virginia on this proposition, because I was unable to ascertain what it was. The Senator from Virginia himself said he never approved it. Who approved it? I said the Senator from Virginia did. I will read his letter. That is the way it got in. I did not mention the Senator from Virginia at all until he brought in the question of his position.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from Florida made this mistake: I was a member, on the part of the Senate, of the joint committee to investigate good roads. The Senator said that committee had approved the Bourne bill. I said that it had not; that it had made no recommendation; and that he was mistaken in that statement. Then the Senator read the letter.

Mr. BRYAN. That is right.

Mr. SWANSON. He read the letter of the Senator from North Carolina and myself approving the report. Then I said that that report made no recommendation approving the Bourne bill, which is true; and the Senator can not find that the Senator from North Carolina and myself have ever approved the Bourne bill. We have always antagonized it.

Mr. President, the issue is as to the reference of this bill. I was not in the Chamber, and did not know until after it had occurred, that the bill had been referred to the Agricultural Committee. I shall vote not to discharge that committee; I shall vote for this bill to stay in the Agricultural Committee. The Agricultural Committee reported a bill last year for Federal aid to good roads not in accordance with the Bourne bill. I believe, if you are going to get any legislation at this session of Congress for road improvement, unless you are desirous of supporting the Bourne bill, that you can get it better and easier through the Agricultural Committee.

These bills are for road improvement. It would not be advisable to discharge a committee which is favorable to a bill from its consideration and to send it to a committee which is not as favorable to it. I believe from the experience of last year, if this bill is sent back to the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee, it will be reported back with the Bourne bill as a substitute. I have seen no changes in the committee that would justify a different view. If you want the Bourne bill reported favorably, which proposes to sell \$1,000,000,000 worth of bonds, and not have a practical plan for road improvements, vote to discharge this committee from the consideration of the bill and send it to the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee; and I am apprehensive that that will be the result, though there are many members of the committee who do not favor the Bourne bill.

Sensors, this issue is distinct; it is clear; it is specific. If you favor a bill somewhat on the lines of the House bill, if you want the Federal Government to aid roads and to make an appropriation accordingly, the place for this bill at this session of Congress is with the Agricultural Committee. If you want the matter delayed, if you want it jeopardized, send the bill to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and I fear that we shall be wrangling there for six months before we get any legislation of any kind or character reported.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me for one moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SWANSON. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, it occurs to me that the criticism the Senator from Virginia makes of the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee is not justified. I do not think it is altogether good legislative ethics—it is hardly fair to send a bill to a committee without reference to the subject matter treated in the bill because the committee to which it is referred is leaning toward or against the bill. Committees are created to perform a certain function, and I maintain they should act

with the same poise and patriotic purposes which characterize the courts in the performance of their duties. Now, the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee, as I understand it, is the committee to which all legislation or proposed legislation of this character has heretofore been referred.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No.

Mr. SWANSON. No; the Senator from Mississippi is mistaken.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Listen just one moment, and then the Senator can correct me. Of course I may be mistaken in this, that this bill was not sent to that committee because Senators favorable to the bill had an idea that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was favorable to it and that possibly the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee was not; but if Senators want to pass a bill to which the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads is not favorable, but which should go to the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee because of the subject matter of the bill, after the committee has been given an opportunity to act upon it, if it fails to report the bill the proper course to pursue would be to discharge that committee from the consideration of it and then let the Senate deal with it.

I want to say to the Senator in this connection that I am very desirous of having good-roads legislation enacted at this session. I think there is a great deal of virtue and merit in the Bourne bill. I think the plan embodied in that bill is almost ideal; but if I find that I can not get that, then I am going to take the next best thing; but I think, under the Constitution and under the rules and the precedents of the Senate, that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads is entitled to consider this bill and that it ought to be recommitted to that committee. This is not the time, however, to discuss the relative merits of the bills.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported a bill for good roads at the last session of Congress. Most bills of this character have been referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, but, under the rules of the Senate, there is no specific designation for the reference of a bill, except in the case of general appropriation bills, which must be referred to the Appropriations Committee. Bills relating to naval appropriations and naval matters the rules specify shall be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and bills proposing appropriations for the Army and relating to the Army are referred to the Committee on Military Affairs; but, outside of that, the Senate has absolute control of the reference of bills introduced, and the rules are silent as to where bills shall be referred except, as I have said, in the case of general appropriation bills and the other bills which I have instanced.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. SWANSON. In a moment. With these exceptions, the question of reference has been left to the Senate, so that the Senate in its wisdom can refer bills to committees that are in accord with the opinions and desires of the Senate.

I am a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, but I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I think the legislation itself is more important than pride of committee. If the bill goes to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I can have nothing to do with it until it reaches the floor of the Senate. As I have said, I am a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, but more important than that the bill should go to that committee or that any particular committee should have control of this matter is the fact that it should go to a committee that would be favorable to the legislation desired.

Mr. HARDWICK. Now will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield now.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator has introduced a couple of good-roads bills himself at this session, has he not?

Mr. SWANSON. I have.

Mr. HARDWICK. He had them referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, had he not?

Mr. SWANSON. I had.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is all.

Mr. SWANSON. I have a right to suggest the reference of the bills, and if the Senate does not interpose it is proper for them to go to the committee I may indicate; but the position I take is that the Senate, by its rules, has in the case of only five or six general appropriation bills designated where they shall go. The rules provide to which committees those bills shall be referred; but the reference of other bills is left entirely to the Senate to determine.

I believe that if this bill goes to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, it will go to a committee that is more friendly to

road legislation than is the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads; and at this time to discharge the Committee on Agriculture from the consideration of the bill and refer it to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I believe would retard, if not injure, the chances of such legislation. That is the reason I shall vote not to discharge the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry from the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Virginia if he is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. SWANSON. I am not.

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator is a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator has devoted three years at hard work to the preparation of this report. In the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads we could have the benefit of his research, but the Senator can not get that before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, the committee that had charge of a bill of this kind at the last session had that valuable information. We were wrangling over it about three or four months, and when action was taken a majority reported the Bourne bill, which provided for a sale of \$500,000,000 or \$1,000,000,000 worth of bonds.

Mr. BRYAN. I have no doubt that was partially induced by the report that the Senator joined in.

Mr. SWANSON. There was no report recommending the Bourne bill. I should like to have the Senator find such a report. He seems now to be suggesting what he has taken back.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia one question. Does he not feel sure that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry understands the measure that his subcommittee reported to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads at the last session and will give it most favorable consideration? I believe I was on the subcommittee with him.

Mr. SWANSON. Under the rules of the Senate, the Senate has a right to dispose of the reference of this bill. There is no rule requiring the reference of this bill to any particular committee; and, as I understand, the question now is whether it shall be referred to a committee more favorable to the legislation or to a committee that is, as constituted, less favorable to it. With that view, I shall vote against discharging the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry from the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber at the time this discussion began. Consequently I do not know what was said with reference to the report to which the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] has referred; but I hold in my hand the bill which has been passed by the House and which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of this body. The chairman of that committee is out of the city; and it seems to me that, pending his return, this matter ought to go over. But outside of that, Mr. President, when I look at this bill, I can not see how anyone can doubt that the appropriate committee to consider it is the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to make a statement just here, reference having been made to the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry from the city, I desire to say that the question came up in the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads as to the re-reference of this bill to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. The suggestion was made that members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should be seen before any motion was made on the floor of the Senate to re-refer the bill. I myself went to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and apprised him of what had been done in the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. I am not prepared to say whether he was in favor of the bill being re-referred or whether he was against it; but I am prepared to say that he was thoroughly apprised of the pending action. He was informed that it would be taken in the next few days, if not the approximate date. I simply desired to make that statement.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I feel that just at this moment I should also make a statement. I conferred with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] yesterday, a few moments before he left, and he expressed to me his opposition to referring the bill to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. I told him what we intended to do and that I thought the bill ought to be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post

Roads. He said he did not think so, and would antagonize such a reference. I merely want to make the statement. I think it is due the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senate that I should.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, what is this bill and what does it contain that would indicate that it should be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads as against the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry? It is entitled "An act to provide that in order to promote agriculture, afford better facilities for rural transportation and marketing farm products, and encourage the development of a general system of improved highways, the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall in certain cases aid the States in the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads which may be used in the transportation of interstate commerce, military supplies, or postal matter."

Mr. President, all through this bill the machinery to be used is that of the Agricultural Department. I do not see where the Post Office Department would have any jurisdiction with respect to the matter.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will.

Mr. HARDWICK. The power to appropriate at all depends on the power to construct and maintain post roads, does it not?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no.

Mr. HARDWICK. It does not?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No, sir.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Democratic platform so states.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The right to regulate interstate commerce is just as clearly a Federal right.

Mr. HARDWICK. But the principle the Senator is pledged to support, and that I am pledged to support as members of the Democratic Party, is to aid in the establishment and improvement of post roads.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Post roads also may be involved.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, interstate roads may be post roads.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; a post road may be a part of an interstate road.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to call the Senator's attention to one fact in connection with the position which he has taken, and that is that, although post roads may be involved, is it not true that all the machinery of the Government with reference to the improvement of roads is in the Agricultural Department?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Certainly, it is.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And that there is now a bureau in that department, and the work contemplated by the bill, although it may be upon post roads, will be done by the Agricultural Department and under the supervision of a bureau now established in that department which comes constantly before the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Well, the power that the Agricultural Department has is merely a power created by statute, and we might change it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then, Mr. President, would it not be necessary to reverse our entire policy in the past, take the Bureau of Roads away from the Agricultural Department, break up all we have done there in the line of developing experts in road building, and transfer them to the Post Office Department? Ought not the bill to go to the committee which supervises the department that does the work?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, in this bill the references to the Agricultural Department are numerous. For instance, it provides—

The Secretary of Agriculture shall examine said surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of cost, and determine what would be the reasonable cost of such proposed improvements—

And so forth.

Again it provides—

that upon receipt of such written statement the said State highway department may transmit to the Secretary of Agriculture a statement in writing notifying him that such proposed construction, improvement, or maintenance will be undertaken upon the terms proposed.

Another provision is this:

That when the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that said construction, improvement, or maintenance of said road has been finished in compliance with said surveys, plans, and specifications he shall cause to be paid to the proper authority of said State whatever remains unpaid of the amount which he has stated, as hereinbefore provided, would be given to aid said State in said proposed construction, improvement, or maintenance of said road.

Again it is provided—

that the Secretary of Agriculture may make, or cause to be made, such inspection and examinations of any road constructed, improved, or maintained.

Again the bill provides—

that the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, from time to time make payments upon such construction, improvement, or maintenance as the same progresses.

There is no reference to the Post Office Department in this bill. There is no indication whatever that the Post Office Department shall have any connection with it whatever, and it does not seem to me that this bill should be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads when it is a bill that is confined solely and purely in administration, in the making of contracts, in the completing of contracts, and in approving the same, to the Secretary of Agriculture. It seems to me the only committee to which it should be referred is the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator, I suggest to him that an additional reason is found beginning in line 9, on page 6, where this provision is set forth:

One of the purposes of this act being to encourage and promote the improvement of a general system of roads leading from cities, towns, and railway stations into the adjacent farming communities.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; Mr. President. I do not see that that contains anything that would make it a Post Office matter. There is no reference—

Mr. BRYAN. I was suggesting that as an additional reason why it should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I am glad to have the cooperation of the Senator from Florida. It seems to me that this is a bill which should be kept in the Agricultural Department; and I feel that the matter ought not to be disposed of in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I trust the Senate will not act upon the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] that this matter be postponed or put over until the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may return. I understand the probabilities are that he will be absent from the Chamber for two or three weeks, and I think there is very strong reason why this legislation should be speeded rather than retarded.

I do not see any reason why we should wait for the chairman. His wishes are not to control in this matter. The wishes of the Senate are to control. I believe the Senate desires to get this bill upon the calendar in time to give a reasonable chance for action upon it at this session of Congress.

What I am interested in is in getting this matter before the Senate. Of course, I want, as does every other friend of the measure, a favorable report; but I want to get it on the calendar in due time so that it will not be again, as it has been heretofore, crowded out by other legislation.

Ordinarily I agree with the statement which has been made that all matters should be in the first instance referred to the appropriate committee under our rules and under our practice. I would not, ordinarily, vote to take a matter from a committee that is clearly entitled to it and give it to another committee for the purpose of securing a favorable report or more expeditious action. But, Mr. President, it is clear to my mind from reading this bill that the bill is, to say the least, as appropriately referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as it would be to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. In fact, as the Senator from Colorado has suggested, I think it is more appropriate to refer it to the former committee.

I do not undertake to say whether or not the bill confers powers that we can not under the Constitution confer. I do not think it is necessary now to discuss the question of power at all. The question is where the bill should go as it is written. It may be that the bill is so written as not to make a proper basis of power for congressional action; but the determination of the question of what committee it should go to must depend upon what the bill provides and proposes and not upon whether or not it violates a constitutional provision.

I thought when the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] read a little while ago from the preamble that that was a mere general, loose statement of the purposes of the bill, such as we frequently find in preambles; but I find that the very first enacting section of the bill repeats verbatim the preamble, and the purpose of the legislation is declared to be a specifically rural and agricultural purpose. It is declared to be "in order to promote agriculture." I think Congress has power to appropriate money for that purpose. It is declared to be "to afford better facilities for rural transportation and marketing farm products." I think Congress has power to appropriate money for that purpose.

Those are declared to be the purposes of the bill. That is the express, specific declaration, the legislative intent and purpose. Then follows, Mr. President, the declaration that when these roads have been constructed for that purpose they "may" be

used for the transportation of interstate commerce, military supplies, or postal routes.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator that in arriving at the amounts to be allotted to the States, after an appropriation of \$65,000 to each State, the balance is to be divided equally upon the basis of population and upon the basis that the total amount of mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes in such States bears to the mileage of the whole country of rural free delivery and star mail routes.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not saying, Mr. President, that we do not want this legislation in part for postal purposes.

Mr. BRYAN. I am pointing out to the Senator that one-half of this money is to be spent on rural post roads.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have no doubt in the world that that is, in part, the purpose of the bill; but the point I am making is, that the declared purpose is to promote agriculture and to afford better facilities for rural transportation and marketing farm products; and then, after the road is built for that purpose, it is declared that it "may" be put to the Federal uses enumerated, one of them being for postal routes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, one-half of it is on account of census population. We are not going to refer it to the Committee on the Census.

Mr. SIMMONS. I should think not.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Why not?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Because it is to be administered in the Agricultural Department; because it is to be administered under an arm of the Government that reports to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; that discusses its work annually with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and the whole work will be done in connection with that committee.

Mr. SIMMONS. The declaration is made that after they are built for agricultural purposes these roads may be used in interstate commerce and for military purposes or for postal routes—and, by the way, the only reference to postal routes or to the Post Office Department, so far as I have seen, is contained in those two words, "postal routes." All the balance of the bill is with reference to things that are to be done by the Agricultural Department with the machinery that we have prepared by law for doing the work that department is authorized and directed to do under this bill.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida is going to take the position that this bill must go to the Post Office Committee because it says that these roads may be used as postal roads, you might just as well take the position that the bill should be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce because it says they may be used in interstate commerce. You might as well take the position that it has to be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs because it says the roads may be used for military purposes.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, what is the necessity, then, of having a Committee on Roads at all in the Senate?

Mr. SIMMONS. I might with equal pertinence ask the Senator what is the necessity of having a Committee on Interstate Commerce and a Committee on Military Affairs or a Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. BRYAN. Oh, they have other things to consider. This committee deals only with post offices and post roads.

Mr. SIMMONS. What is the necessity for having a Committee on Agriculture if you are going to refer to the Post Office Committee a bill that the Agricultural Department is required by the law, and by its terms, to administer?

Mr. BRYAN. I think there is a very easy answer to that. This is the only committee of the Senate that deals with roads, and its only purpose is to deal with post offices and post roads.

In the case of one-half of this money, the amount is to be arrived at by the proportion of the mileage of free-delivery routes that the mails are carried over in each State.

Mr. SIMMONS. Oh, I would agree with the Senator if the road was being built entirely and exclusively for the purpose of postal routes and nothing else. Then the Post Office Committee would be the only committee of the Senate that would have jurisdiction of it. But it is to be built for other purposes as well as that, and that is not the biggest purpose declared in this bill. So far as the declaration of the purpose of the bill is concerned—I mean the literal, technical declaration of purpose—it is not the most important thing.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida a question.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Since the name "Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads" was given to that committee, has there ever been an appropriation made by that committee for the construction and repair of a road?

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I have not been on the committee during the whole of its existence.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Well, since the Senator has been on it.

Mr. BRYAN. I am not sure.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I will answer that question, if the Senator will permit me. The first and only appropriation that I recall by any committee for the purpose of aiding in the construction of good roads was favorably reported by the Post Office Committee.

Mr. SHAFROTH. How many such appropriations were made?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Only one.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Only one. That committee has been in existence for 50 or 60 years, has it not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I mean that was in the last two or three years.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I supposed that the word "roads" meant regulating the railroads with relation to mail. That is what I had always supposed was referred to by the word "roads" in connection with that committee.

Mr. SIMMONS. I recall the measure to which the Senator from Alabama has just referred. It was reported by the Post Office Committee; but that was a measure that distinctly concerned itself with building experimental roads for the purpose of obtaining information on the part of the Government as to whether by these modern type roads the Government could effect greater economy in the delivery of our star routes and rural routes mail service.

Mr. President, as I said a little while ago, nowhere in this bill, so far as I have been able to discover, is there any reference to the Post Office Department in connection with the prosecution of the work. The Secretary of Agriculture initiates the whole thing. He decides about the routes, where the money shall be appropriated and expended, whether it shall be used at all, and then it must be used under his supervision.

I think I would be the last one to impugn the purposes of the Post Office Committee. In the first instance I might have had no objections to the bill going to the Post Office Committee, but it was not sent to the Post Office Committee; it was sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], who is a member of that committee, assures the Senate that the committee has the bill now under consideration and is at work on it. I do not know whether the Senator said there had been hearings on it or not, but he said the committee had begun work upon it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The bill was read and studied, and certain additional bills were sent for; and it was before the committee when the Senate met, and we had to adjourn to come to the floor. It is the first measure to come up at the next meeting of the committee, each member having been requested to study certain additional bills in order that we might act upon it first at the next meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SHAFROTH. And amendments have been suggested?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Again, it has been suggested that the Post Office Committee is wedded to a different character of legislation with respect to this subject. The Post Office Committee, I understand, has heretofore shown its hostility to a measure of like sort. The Agricultural Committee is supposed to be favorable.

Having those facts before me, believing that in the first instance this bill could have been appropriately referred to either committee, but in my judgment more appropriately referred to the Agricultural Committee, and since it has been referred to that committee, being interested in the legislation and a speedy report, and believing we are more likely to get a quicker and a favorable report from that committee than from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, having a right to exercise a choice, because the bill could be appropriately referred to either one of these committees, in these circumstances I would unhesitatingly exercise that choice in favor of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina allow me to make a statement just here?

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The Senator said that the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee was opposed to this bill and wedded to some other measure. I want to state, as one member of the committee—and I think there are others who have the same attitude toward it that I have—that the object was to get the most efficient legislation we could in reference to this matter, without any prejudice for or against any bill.

I admit that on account of absence in 1914, and last year in view of the fact that we were not in session, I have not had an opportunity to study all the provisions of the several bills that

came before the committee; but I am of opinion that in view of the parcel post and its direct relation to the rural communities and the emphasis that has been placed upon it; the members of that committee are as heartily in favor of doing all that can be done legitimately for the benefit of the rural communities as are the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I am a member of both committees; and my attitude would be that, as has been pointed out here, this commission was appointed for the purpose of gathering data, and its report was made to the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee. Its members had full and definite knowledge of all the circumstances that are essential in providing for a proper bill. I do not think the question should come before the Senate as to the attitude of a committee which has concurrent jurisdiction, so to speak. The Agricultural Committee has the interests of the rural communities at heart. The Post Office Committee preeminently has the same interests at heart, and the means of reaching the end are identical.

It seems to me that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, if it does its duty, should take every one of these bills and investigate which would best serve the purpose for which the legislation is intended; and I, as a member of both committees—the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—would work just as heartily on the matter without regard to which committee it came before. Whatever bills are there, it seems to me it is the duty of each and every member to take the merits of the bill, and not be wedded to one system as against another or in favor of one bill as against another bill. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is interested in this matter, and I collaborated with him, to the extent of the little opportunity I had, along the very lines that are here set forth in the Shackleford bill. I gave what aid I could at that time to that bill.

In view of the fact that the appropriation is to be administered by the Post Office Department, and in view of the work that department is to do, especially in regard to the parcel post, it seems to me that the Post Office Committee is preeminently the committee to which bills of this character should be referred. Then, if the Senate sees fit, because of prejudice for or against a bill, because of its authorship, or because of what it contains, to amend it here, it has the perfect right to amend any form of good-roads bill in conformity with what it desires, whether it comes from the Agricultural Committee or whether it comes from the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee. As these bills heretofore have been discussed by the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee, and the commission was appointed from that committee, I think that is the proper place for the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, one remark was made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] to which I call attention. He said that by some "sharp trick" this bill reached the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I hardly think he meant what he said. So far as I know, there were several of us watching, intending to move that it be sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I was, but did not get an opportunity to make the motion, because it was laid before the Senate when I was called to the Marble Room, and it was referred to that committee by the Presiding Officer without a motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was the trickster.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I should think it would have been so referred because of the title, no matter what the bill contained.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Undoubtedly; and when we get to the substance of the bill, unquestionably the more you study the substance of the bill the more clearly the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should be charged with its consideration.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 381.

The Senate, as in the Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I notice a misprint in the reprint of the Philippine bill. It appears in line 3, page 36. It reads that "the President shall reserve or acquire such lands and rights and privileges appurtenant thereto as may, in his judgment, be required by the United States for naval bases and coaling stations within the territory of said Philippines." The word "shall" appears in the original amendment. It was amended in the Senate by striking out "shall" and inserting the word "may," so as to read "the President may

reserve or acquire," and so forth. I take it for granted that that amendment appears in the official copy. If there is any doubt about it, I direct the attention of the chairman to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAMES in the chair). The Secretary informs the Chair that in the original amendment the word is "may" instead of "shall."

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. That is all; I wanted it understood that the word is "may."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], which will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. The sum of \$20,000,000 is hereby appropriated to be expended under the direction of the President, through the Philippine Commission, in aid of the instruction of the Filipinos in a common language, in the principles of free government, and in industrial pursuits; and also in aid of an agricultural bank in the Philippines.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Hollis	Myers	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Hughes	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Husting	Newlands	Smoot
Bryan	James	Norris	Sterling
Chamberlain	Johnson, Me.	O'Gorman	Stone
Chilton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Sutherland
Clapp	Jones	Page	Swanson
Clarke, Ark.	Kenyon	Phelan	Thomas
Colt	La Follette	Pittman	Underwood
Cummins	Lane	Polindexter	Vardaman
Curtis	Lea, Tenn.	Pomerene	Wadsworth
du Pont	Lee, Md.	Ransdell	Walsh
Fletcher	Lewis	Saulsbury	Warren
Gallinger	Lippitt	Sheppard	Williams
Gronna	McCumber	Simmons	
Harding	McLean		
Hardwick	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. CHILTON. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. BRADY] on account of illness. This statement will stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to have the Secretary state the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will again state the amendment to the Senate.

The SECRETARY. Add a new section to the bill, as follows:

SEC. —. The sum of \$20,000,000 is hereby appropriated to be expended under the direction of the President, through the Philippine Commission, in aid of the instruction of the Filipinos in a common language, in the principles of free government, and in industrial pursuits; and also in aid of an agricultural bank in the Philippines.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to perfect the amendment by substituting the sum of "\$10,000,000" for "\$20,000,000" and by adding after the words "agricultural bank" the words "and aid of irrigation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has a right to modify his amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, before that amendment is submitted I wish to say that the people of this country by the thousands need the help of this Government both in securing Federal aid in credit and in educational matters. I do not think it is going to make much difference to them whether the Moros talk the English language or whether they continue to speak their own, or whether a Moro has 400 wives or 1 or none; if he annexes the larger number, the joke will be upon him and not upon us. I am willing to let him fight it out himself. The people of this country need aid, and no money need be appropriated for a people who would be glad to pay an equal sum to get us out of their country. [Laughter.]

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words regarding the amendment I have offered. I assume that it is the desire of every Senator on this floor that the United States should withdraw from the Philippine Islands with credit. Yesterday I stated, and it is well known to the Senate, that the training of the Filipino people in a common language had not yet been accomplished; that it would be utterly impossible for them to conduct self-government without being able to communicate to each other their ideas in a common language, and that whilst much had been done in this direction, much remains to be done. I think that under existing conditions, as we propose to withdraw from those islands within a period at

the most of five years, we should apply a little pressure to the matter of training, and inasmuch as the Filipino people themselves have not sufficient insular or municipal revenues to take care of this matter we ought to add ten or twenty million dollars to the billion dollars which we have already expended, directly and indirectly, in connection with the Philippines in advancing this laudable purpose.

I have received a memorandum from the Insular Bureau regarding the things that might well be done to aid the Filipinos in preparation for the tremendous struggle that will come when the connection between those islands and this protecting Government is cut. I find that I was mistaken in saying that the sum of only \$2,000,000 annually is now employed in those islands in the education of 500,000 children out of a total of 2,000,000 children. I find that the total sum of \$3,400,000 is being spent, of which about \$1,000,000 comes from municipal government and the rest comes from the provincial government and the central government. That means about \$7 a head, whereas in this country we expend about \$30 a head, and as I stated yesterday only 500,000 out of the 2,000,000 children of school age are being educated. It is suggested by the Insular Bureau that the sum of \$1,000,000 a year for five years might well be added to this expenditure.

The memorandum which I have received states what would be done in an intensive way would be the employment of competent teachers, and those teachers must be Americans, because all the competent Filipino teachers who are available are now employed.

Particularly should these teachers be Americans, if intensive instruction in the English language is to be undertaken.

It has been heretofore found practicable to maintain in the islands several hundred more American teachers than are at present so employed.

The money therefore which could be used intelligently and to advantage, without involving the Philippine Government in future expenditures, would be very largely by the employment of American teachers very much as they are at present employed—teachers of domestic science, teachers of manual training, teachers of agriculture—all of whom, in addition, could be teachers of English.

The amount of money that could be expended for this purpose would be approximately \$1,000,000 per annum. This is assuming that the Philippine Government would continue its own expenditures for education, which, of course, we would insist upon.

I assume, of course, that under the power given to the President, he would see that this sum of \$1,000,000 per annum in the training of the Filipino people would be added to the expenditure now being annually made by the Filipinos.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator here why he designates a common language. His argument would indicate the English language.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. If he proposes to instruct them in the English language, why does he not say so, instead of using the words "a common language"?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I have no objection to a change in the wording.

Mr. McCUMBER. I did not know but the Senator had in mind practicing upon the Filipinos the new Volupuk language, or whatever it is called.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I assume, of course, that they will continue the use of the English language. A very large proportion of the Filipino people are now trained in it. I presume that perhaps a fourth or perhaps a fifth of the Filipino people can speak, more or less perfectly or imperfectly, the English language.

With reference to agriculture and lands the Insular Bureau declares that—

The two great needs of agriculture are land surveys, so that titles may be registered and title to public land acquired readily, and irrigation.

These are the two wants.

I am surprised to receive a statement from the Insular Bureau that the estimate of expenditures for surveys will be \$25,000,000. I think that sum is so large, possibly, Congress would not be willing to appropriate it, though I recall that when I was there one of the chief difficulties, with reference to the lands of the islands, was the fact that there had been no adequate surveys, that the boundaries of existing holdings were not accurately defined, and that it was difficult, if not impossible, in making grants of public lands to give any adequate description of their location, and also that the registration of title was so imperfect as to make the acquisition of lands there very difficult. I would not expect to cover the subject of surveys in this appropriation.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. There are two things about the amendment concerning which I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada, for I do not understand their application or connection with the bill that is under consideration. The Senator in his amendment provides that the money shall be expended through the Philippine Commission. The bill, not considering the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, abolishes the Philippine Commission. What agency does the Senator from Nevada expect to employ in the expenditure of the money?

Mr. NEWLANDS. In that case I would suggest to substitute the word "government" for "commission."

Mr. CUMMINS. There is a Philippine Legislature established by the bill that takes the place of the Philippine Commission; that is, there is a senate or a higher legislative body that is substituted for the Philippine Commission. Does the Senator expect that the Philippine Legislature will take this money and use it?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Of course the bill does not abolish the office of Governor General. The Governor General will continue, and he is a part of the Philippine government. So I should say that the Philippine government would consist, then, of the Governor General and the legislature.

Mr. CUMMINS. One thing more which bothers me is this: The Senate adopted an amendment yesterday which will authorize the immediate evacuation of the Philippine Islands, our departure to become complete and the sovereignty to be entirely transferred at the end of two years. The Senator does not expect all this money to be expended within two years. Now, what will become of the remainder of the money?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I understand the bill provides that we are to withdraw in not less than two years and not more than four years.

Mr. CUMMINS. No; I do not so understand it. The bill provides for immediate withdrawal, but says that the transfer shall not be complete until two years from this time and not more than four years, but whether it is two years or four years, the Senator from Nevada can not expect to spend all this money even within two years, and what would become of the remainder?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should expect the President of the United States to expend only such part of this appropriation as he can expend with good judgment, and if it is impossible to expend the whole there will be a balance remaining. I believe, however, that within a period of four years and possibly within a period of two years the sum of \$10,000,000 could be expended to immense advantage in those islands and to the advantage of the purpose we have in view—the preparation of those people for self-government.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator will allow me, I should like to suggest that I have not any doubt we could expend it in six months to the great advantage of those islands. I think there ought to be some limitation or arrangement as to just how long it is going to take to spend it. There is no trouble about spending American money over there for the benefit of the islands.

Mr. CUMMINS. Did the Senator from Nevada have it in view to spend the \$10,000,000 for this purpose within two years?

Mr. NEWLANDS. If the President considers that it is advisable to do it.

Mr. CUMMINS. If the President thinks it can not be expended efficiently within that time, what becomes of the remainder?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I presume it remains in the United States Treasury.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is not the purpose of the Senator to transfer the remainder to the new government to be established there?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Oh, no; I have no such purpose.

Mr. CUMMINS. Why not? Is it not just as important that they should become educated after our sovereignty ceases as before?

Mr. NEWLANDS. My view is that when they withdraw, our connection from them will absolutely cease. I want them to lead a thoroughly individualized life, not under our protection in any form. I have no objection, if the President should so advise hereafter, possibly to appropriate a specific sum for a specific purpose before we withdraw, even though the money may not be expended until after we withdraw; but it is the purpose of the amendment to expend a reasonable sum within the period of two or four years. I believe it will be impossible to accomplish the withdrawal before four years, and I have not the slightest idea but that \$10,000,000 could be most profitably expended in those islands in the interest of the Philippine people.

Mr. CUMMINS. One more question, if I may.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield further?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. There are a great many people in our own country who need education, a great many more than are permitted to secure an education.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does not the Senator believe that we ought to spend our money for our own people, if they need the money, rather than for the people of the Philippines?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should say so.

Mr. CUMMINS. Where does the Senator expect to get the \$20,000,000 or \$10,000,000?

Mr. NEWLANDS. By additional taxation, if necessary.

Mr. CUMMINS. But has the Senator any well-defined idea upon whom he will lay this additional burden of taxation?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should levy additional taxes upon incomes and inheritances.

Mr. CUMMINS. Has that been matured upon the Senator's side of the Chamber?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do not know that it has. That is my individual opinion. I am not a member of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is the Senator's individual opinion?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, the Senator's inquiry, of course, is a proper one as to whether our first duty is not to our own people. It is; but we have assumed a duty toward the Philippines. We seized those islands. We took possession of them first in a spirit of conquest. Later on we held them in a spirit of altruism and declared that we are there for the benefit of the Filipino people. The assumption of a duty of that kind requires the expenditure of some money. We have expended enormous sums in the past in military and naval expenditures necessary to suppress Filipino independence. I think we may well expend a little more in promoting it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Can the Senator from Nevada state approximately how much money has been expended upon the Philippine Islands since the occupancy of the islands?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Very little has been spent directly upon the Philippine Islands themselves, as I understand. There were some two or three million dollars spent when they had cholera and famine there, and I imagine there have been several million dollars spent in fortifications. Our principal expenditure was in conquering the islands and in the military enlargement both of the Army and Navy made necessary by their acquisition. The total expenditure of the whole Spanish-American War was about \$600,000,000; and I think it is safe to say that the enlargement of the Army and Navy caused by our expansion territorially has been some \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000 more annually.

Mr. GALLINGER. And we have spent a large sum in the building of schoolhouses, in furnishing education, and giving instruction to the Filipino children, and in the building of roads, as I read it. I do not know how much we have expended, but in the aggregate it is a very large sum.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do not think that expenditure came out of the Federal Treasury; I think it came out of the insular treasury.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. McLEAN. I will state to the Senator from New Hampshire that, I think, the total expenditure, outside of the military expenses, was less than \$4,000,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is quite surprising to me, as I had supposed it was much greater.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Our main effort has been to make the insular revenues pay all the expenses of those islands; and from that point of view the work has been excellently done. I do not think there ever has been in the history of the world so creditable a piece of colonial administration as that exhibited in the Philippine Islands under Mr. Taft and his successors. It seems to me that the work has been done with the strictest economy and without calling upon the Federal Treasury for any purely insular demands, except the insular demands to which the Senator from Connecticut refers, involving meeting conditions of cholera and in some degree involving good roads.

Now, it is absolutely essential to those islands that they should have a proper agricultural system established. They have not one as yet. Irrigation has not been advanced as it ought to have been. We ought to have sent engineers from our Reclamation Service over there immediately after the acquisition of the islands and mapped out a scheme of irriga-

tion, for they are dependent upon irrigation there; they can not depend upon the natural fall of the waters from the heavens.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If Japan should take the islands, why not let Japanese engineers go over there and establish an irrigation system?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Well, that is a rather cynical view of the matter. I do not share in the view at all that Japan should take the islands. I hope that Japan will have a proper respect for the independence and integrity of those islands, and that every other country also will. I am unwilling that this Government should assume any obligation to protect the independence of those islands; but I think that we should in every way appeal to the moral sentiment of the nations surrounding them, to the acquisitive nations of the world, to give a common protection to those islands in their struggle to maintain self-government.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator from Nevada, however, voted, as I understand, yesterday that the United States should not interfere in any way whatever to protect them.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes; I do not want the Government of the United States to have any problem in the Orient, involving, possibly, complications that will land us in war, the consequences of which we can not measure. I want to confine the United States practically to domestic problems, which are numerous and complicated, which involve the building up of a country that ultimately will have a population of four or five hundred million people, individual States surpassing in population in the future great empires as they exist to-day. That will be a problem which will be sufficient for us. I believe that we ought to have attended to our own affairs from the start; that we ought never to have undertaken this foreign problem; but having undertaken it, it seems the clear duty of the United States in withdrawing from the job is to do it with as much humanity and even generosity to those people as is possible.

When I was interrupted, I was speaking about irrigation. The memorandum from the Insular Bureau which I hold in my hands states:

Irrigation: The Philippine government has several times in the past 12 years taken up this subject, but has not made considerable progress. As a result land on which three crops per year could be produced, produces with difficulty one crop, and a great deal of land is of little value which would be of immense value.

The difficulty with undertaking hurriedly irrigation work is well recognized by all engineers experienced in that work. It would be very difficult, beginning promptly and with a large amount of money, to complete in four years irrigation works meeting the necessities of any large part of the islands without wastefulness. Generally speaking, the necessary observations preliminary to the work are lacking. These observations should cover a period of years.

In many places the matter is complicated by the ownership of water rights, which would have to be adjusted. It is believed that if \$10,000,000 were made immediately available for this purpose the amount could be intelligently expended in such a way as to justify the expenditure, producing thereafter an income to the Philippine government. This, of course, would not by any means mean that all of the necessary irrigation work in the islands would be completed. It would mean that approximately six reasonably large projects could be undertaken and concluded within four years. More than this could not be done to advantage.

I will say, with reference to that, that we have a population of 7,000,000 in those islands; we have been in possession of those islands for over 15 years; a complete system of irrigation is absolutely essential to the development of agriculture in those islands; and yet we have hardly taken the initial step toward the inauguration of a proper system. Why? Simply because it is utterly impossible to raise the revenue from insular sources. Their revenue, as I stated yesterday, is only \$11,000,000 per annum, and the municipal and provincial revenues added make a total revenue of only \$17,000,000. In our arid region, where perhaps in the arid and semiarid States possibly we have two or three million people, we have already expended within the last 10 years nearly \$80,000,000 in irrigation works, Government works alone; but yet during that period practically nothing has been expended in the Philippine Islands.

It is utterly impossible for private capital to take hold of these enterprises. In order to take hold of an irrigation enterprise you must have control over the sources of the water; control of the water rights and of the rivers; and you must also have absolute control of a sufficient area of land to make the construction of the irrigation works profitable in the added value of the land. That is one of the reasons why our Government has entered upon these irrigation works. We have reached the limits of individual and private enterprise in that direction. So the Government was obliged to take it up. The insular government, there, however, is unable to do so. The United States ought

to have undertaken it, and ought to have undertaken it 15 years ago.

I shall ask leave to put into the Record my statement at a hearing before the Philippines Committee on this subject many years ago, calling attention to the importance of the speedy perfection of these irrigation schemes and also to the importance of organizing an agricultural bank.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, permission to do so will be granted.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The economic efficiency in the Philippine Islands has hardly been increased at all during our 15 years of stay. It has not increased, because we have applied ourselves simply to questions of government, of education, and of training, instead of to the economic development of the islands. I fear that when our protection is withdrawn and the excellent sanitation of the islands which is now being carried on under American rule is diminished we shall again have outbreaks of diseases, such as cholera and others afflicting men, and the numerous diseases so destructive of cattle and animals.

In addition to that, if those people are not put upon their feet so that the agricultural possibilities of the islands may be developed, we shall find that there will be conditions of suffering and poverty and distress that will overwhelm those islands and practically destroy everything that we have accomplished thus far in fitting them for self-government.

That view does not deter me at all, so far as I am concerned, from pursuing the fixed purpose of withdrawing from those islands as soon as possible; but the possibility of those conditions does induce me, notwithstanding there is a deficit in the Treasury, notwithstanding that we shall need large supplies of money for our military and naval preparations, and notwithstanding that it will be necessary to increase the taxation of the country, now to provide for the discharge of this moral duty which rests upon us.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, the motive that moves the able and learned Senator from Nevada in his effort to confer this benefaction upon the Philippine people is a tribute to his good heart; but I want to ask the Senator if, as a trustee of the American people, many of whom are in a more indigent condition than are the people of the Philippine Islands, is it fair to take the money derived from taxing the American citizen when our own people need assistance and confer it upon the people in the Philippine Islands? It seems to me that our first obligation is to the people at home; that charity begins there. To take this money out of the pockets of the toilers of America, I repeat, many of whom are more needy and abjectly poorer than are the Filipinos, and to give it to the Filipino would not be fair.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I contend that Uncle Sam is rich enough to take care not only of his own children but also of those waifs away out in the Pacific, over whom he has, against their consent, imposed his sovereignty for nearly 20 years. I think we can take care of both of these matters, and my proposal involves no neglect of American interests.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the Senator. He is always eloquent and instructive, but I desire to say that "Uncle Sam" has no wealth of his own. Every dollar in the National Treasury is coined of the sweat and toil of some wealth producer. "Uncle Sam" has nothing save that which is contributed by the laborers of this Republic, and it is the duty of this Congress, as trustees of the wealth producers of America, to be just rather than generous. There are thousands of poor people in the United States to-day who are quite as much in need of assistance from the Government as the people in the Philippine Islands. Personally I want to assist the Filipinos; I want to see them prosper, build up the waste places in their country. I would help them in every legitimate way possible, but my first obligation is to the people of America. When the Americans shall all be provided with the necessities of life, then I shall be glad to join with the able, patriotic, and altruistic Senator from Nevada in his efforts to promote the welfare of the Filipino.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Well, Mr. President, "Uncle Sam," of course, is a myth. When we refer to "Uncle Sam," we mean the American people. The American people have immense wealth to draw upon; no country in the world is so fortunate as is this. The American people have imposed their sovereignty upon the Filipino people, 7,000 miles away, against their will, and have killed Filipinos because they resisted their authority; and now, having pacified them, having entered upon this work

of altruism and helpfulness, all I want to do is to fairly round it out, so that the world can say that the work has been performed in a creditable manner, and so that the Filipino people themselves will not have to reproach us hereafter for any act of either commission or omission.

Now, Mr. President, with reference to an agricultural bank, this report from the Insular Bureau says:

In the way of an agricultural bank, this matter could be taken care of by the Philippine government and its present agencies, provided there were included in the pending bill a provision authorizing the Philippine government to guarantee the land-mortgage bonds issued by such bank and to pay interest and principal of such bonds in case the bank should default.

The Filipino Bank has to-day a capital of \$1,500,000, and not \$500,000, as I erroneously stated yesterday. That is, of course, insufficient. We are all beginning to realize in this country the necessity of agricultural banks. The question of rural credits is one of the great questions before the country to-day. We are slowly following in the steps of the European countries in this direction, whose efforts have been directed in the line of reducing the rates of interest to the producers of farm products. We all know that in this country the producers of farm products have to pay higher rates of interest than almost any other class of our people, and we are making an effort, through Government aid, through land banks and agricultural banks and rural credits, to bring the interest charged agricultural communities down to the common level of interest that is charged in manufacturing and in commerce.

The difficulties under which we suffer are, however, enormously exaggerated in the Philippine Islands. I can not pretend to state the excessive rates of interest which I heard were charged in the Philippine Islands whilst I was there, rates of interest which kept the producers within the grasp of the money lenders, so that they were in practical slavery, mortgaging one crop after another in advance of its production to the money lenders, and unable ever to get out of their control.

It seems that the Philippine Commission has urged the organization of an agricultural bank. My view was that, inasmuch as the insular revenues were not sufficient to provide a capital for such a bank, the United States ought to have established one 15 years ago; and I urged upon the Philippine Committee the establishment of a bank with a capital of \$10,000,000. That was not done. So the insular government struggled feebly with the question itself, and they have utilized, I believe, their gold reserve in some way as a foundation for credit by an agricultural bank, which has a capital of only \$1,500,000. It seems to me that we might well appropriate a considerable sum for this purpose. It seems to me that we can either make a gift of an adequate sum to an agricultural bank, properly guarded for this purpose, or we can make a loan which may be subsequently repaid when the insular revenue is in a condition for repayment.

The memorandum which I have received states that the pressing needs of those islands, then, for the next four years will be \$4,000,000 for education, \$25,000,000 for a survey, and \$10,000,000 for irrigation. I eliminate the question of survey, because I do not think that Congress would be disposed to enter upon that work; but I do think that the sum of \$10,000,000, put under the control of the President, to be expended by him with the aid of the Philippine government, will do a great deal in the way of providing a basis for an agricultural bank, a proper irrigation system, and for the education of those people in a common language and in industrial pursuits.

So far as the pagan people of the southern islands, numbering over a million, and the savage tribes are concerned, I have made no calculation as to their possible necessities. I think this whole matter should be left to the discretion of the President; and I have no doubt that the recommendations of the very competent insular government which we have established will be such as to insure that the money will be wisely and not foolishly expended. I trust, Mr. President, that the amendment as modified will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if I understand the purpose of this bill it is to carry out the pledge of the Democratic Party to the people of the Philippine Islands to give them their independence as soon as possible. I do not understand that the Democratic Party, or anybody else in this country, has gone so far as to promise those people or assure them anything further than that beyond what may be involved in the detailed work of carrying that policy into successful operation. Now, it is proposed, in addition to withdrawing from the islands, to endow the Philippine people with a part of the revenues of the United

States and devote the sum of \$20,000,000 to their uplift and improvement.

Mr. President, I have no idea that the Senate is going to endorse or adopt this amendment. At the same time I want to express my dissent from such a proposition. In this body, indeed in both Houses of Congress, we have incurred the habit of thinking in millions. When it comes to legislation a million dollars amounts to about as much in the contemplation of Congress as an expenditure of 50 cents did at the time of the formation of the Government; but nevertheless \$20,000,000 is a great deal of money, especially when it is proposed to give it away.

Where will it come from? That question was very pertinently asked by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN], and the reply was that Uncle Sam is very wealthy. That is the case, Mr. President, but the Senator from Mississippi aptly replied that all the money that is used in our public expenditures comes from the people in the form of taxation, direct or indirect. The expenses of the Government are not only enormous, but if the so-called plans for preparation for national defense are to be crystallized into legislation it will be necessary to very largely increase not only our revenues but our taxation. I do not know of anybody in the United States or of any interest in the United States that likes to be taxed. My experience is that every interest wants taxation to be borne by other interests, and of course there is a mutuality of objection which makes all forms of proposed revenue legislation extremely disagreeable and annoying to those charged with the duty of its enactment.

I wish I could see somewhere some evidence of an intention to limit our expenses, instead of constantly increasing them. I would just as soon think of taking \$20,000,000 in connection with this bill and putting it in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean as to give it to those people after we have given them their independence or while this proposed law is in process of operation. I do not care personally whether the Filipinos are educated or not; I do not care whether their irrigation systems are completed or not. That is a matter which they must themselves look after when they have been freed from subjection to this country and begin to work out their own destiny.

Personally it makes little difference to me whether Japan takes possession of them or not, or whether some other nation goes and exercises there direct control or suzerainty over them. I think we should get out of there, and get out of there as speedily as possible. The islands have cost us hundreds of millions of dollars; and now it is proposed by this amendment virtually to make them a present of \$2 a piece as a sort of premium, I suppose, or a tip, to accompany our final adieu. I hope this amendment will not be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Hollis	Myers	Smith, Mich.
Beckham	Husting	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	James	Newlands	Smoot
Bryan	Johnson, Me.	Norris	Sterling
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Stone
Chilton	Jones	Page	Sutherland
Clark, Wyo.	Kernyon	Pittman	Swanson
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Polindexter	Thomas
Colt	Lane	Pomerene	Thompson
Cummins	Lee, Tenn.	Ransdell	Tillman
Dillingham	Lee, Md.	Reed	Vardaman
du Pont	Lewis	Robinson	Walsh
Fall	Lippitt	Saulsbury	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Lodge	Shafroth	Warren
Gallinger	McCumber	Sheppard	Williams
Harding	McLean	Shields	
Hardwick	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. CHILTON. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. GOFF] is absent on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, before a vote is taken I should like to perfect this amendment by striking out the words "through the Philippine Commission." I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to perfect his own amendment. That is agreed to.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Then those words are stricken out. I will now ask the Secretary to read the amendment as perfected.

I wish to state, before the vote is taken, that the withdrawal from the Philippines means an immense saving of expenditures hereafter in the complications in the Orient that will be sure to arise out of our holding those islands; that in addition to that it means the saving of an expenditure of at least \$25,000,000

in military and naval expense annually; and that out of these savings the United States may well appropriate \$10,000,000 toward training these people in a common language, principles of free government, and industrial pursuits, and in aid of an agricultural bank and of irrigation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment as perfected by the Senator from Nevada.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add as a new section the following:

SEC. —. That the sum of \$10,000,000 is hereby appropriated to be expended under the direction of the President in aid of the instruction of the Filipinos in a common language, in the principles of free government, and in industrial pursuits, and also in aid of an agricultural bank and in aid of irrigation in the Philippines.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada is a statesmanlike forecast of the probable results of the action recently taken by the Senate, indicating a purpose to withdraw from the Philippines; and sooner or later, and in some connection, some provision of that kind must be seriously considered.

The bill now under consideration, however, is a bill of policies and not a bill of details, nor an appropriation bill. The pecuniary provision for the Philippine Islands is made in the sundry civil appropriation bill. It is altogether likely that if the bill now pending shall be passed by the House of Representatives, the situation thus presented will commend itself to the Committee on Appropriations, and some such provision as that indicated by the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada can be made.

I believe that the amendment adds complications to those that are already sufficiently numerous to tax the patience of the Senate in the consideration of the bill. For that reason alone I feel that I must vote against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARDING (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and for that reason withhold my vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. KERN (when Mr. SHIVELY's name was called). My colleague [Mr. SHIVELY] is paired with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. If I were at liberty to vote—if he were here—I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (after having voted in the negative). I ask if the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I have a general pair with that Senator, and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. CATRON. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN (after having voted in the negative). I desire to inquire if the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has not voted.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have a general pair with that Senator, and as he has not voted I withdraw my vote.

Mr. TILLMAN. I should like to vote, but I have a general pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], and in his absence withhold my vote. I should like to vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], and I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CHILTON. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. GOFF] on account of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 4, nays 67, as follows:

YEAS—4.

Jones	Newlands	Saulsbury	Wadsworth
Ashurst	Gronna	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Hardwick	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Md.
Brandeggee	Hollis	Myers	Smith, Mich.
Bryan	Hughes	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Catron	Husting	Norris	Smoot
Chamberlain	James	O'Gorman	Sterling
Chilton	Johnson, Me.	Page	Sutherland
Clarke, Ark.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Poindexter	Swanson
Colt	Kenyon	Pomerene	Thomas
Cummins	Kern	Ransdell	Thompson
Curtis	Lane	Reed	Townsend
Dillingham	Lea, Tenn.	Robinson	Vardaman
du Pont	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Walsh
Fall	Lewis	Sheppard	Weeks
Fletcher	Lippitt	Simmons	Williams
Gallinger	Lodge		

NOT VOTING—25.

Borah	Goff	Owen	Tillman
Brady	Gore	Penrose	Underwood
Broussard	Harding	Phelan	Warren
Burleigh	La Follette	Pittman	Works
Clapp	McLean	Sherman	
Clark, Wyo.	Oliver	Shively	
Culberson	Overman	Stone	

So Mr. NEWLANDS's amendment was rejected.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I shall not accept this vote as a test of the altruism, the benevolence, and the philanthropy of the American people, of which we have heard so much during this debate. I shall invite the attention of the President to this subject in the hope that at some time he will make a recommendation to Congress upon it. If that is not forthcoming, I shall press it upon appropriation bills or other legislation in the future, in the hope that Senators like the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], who think that this is not the proper place for an appropriation of this kind, but who perhaps are in sympathy with its purpose, will join with me in seeing that we do something in the few remaining years that we have to fit the Filipino people more effectually for the intellectual and economic struggle that is before them.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I will suggest to the Senator from Nevada that he would secure a powerful influence in favor of his amendment if he could attach to the Clarke amendment a proviso that it shall not go into effect until his amendment is adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I await the reading of the next amendment, assuming that it is one I presented.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois offers an amendment which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add to the bill a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. That before the independence and sovereignty of the Philippine Islands shall be proclaimed by the President of the United States the government of the Philippine Islands as constituted shall make and execute a perpetual treaty with the United States guaranteeing freedom of trade to the United States and exemption from all import tariff duties upon any goods, merchandise, or trade from the United States.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I beg at this time to ask that the second amendment I tendered shall be read, as I desire to discuss them both, in order that I may not occupy the floor on two consecutive occasions for one single event. The other amendment tendered may be read now, and we may dispose of them both, as one is inconsistent with the other if either is adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the second amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of the bill, a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. That there shall be vested in the President and by this act he is authorized to enter into any convention or agreement with the administration in power in the government of the Philippines for payment to the United States of such sum of money, and by such method of installment as may return to the United States the sums of money heretofore paid for and for the purposes and government of the Philippine Islands, or such part of said sum expended by the Government of the United States, as to the President of the United States shall, under all the circumstances, appear equitable.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to indulge me for a few moments while I explain what was the purpose of these amendments as I apprehend them.

It has been stated by Senators participating in this debate, beginning with the statement of the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], that the expenditures put out upon the Philippine Islands would reach, possibly, \$800,000,000. Prior to this session, in the sessions of the past, Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, stated the figure of \$600,000,000. Yesterday the junior

Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] called attention to the figure of \$400,000,000. It is evident that an amount between the figure of \$800,000,000 and that of \$400,000,000 has been expended.

Mr. President, we are about to give up these islands in pursuance of our promise and our duty; but I do not feel, sir, that our altruism should go so far as to permit, through inadvertence or design, a punishment of the United States for its kindnesses when it could be rewarded consistently with justice to the islands and with right to the United States.

I invite the attention of Senators, particularly the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and such other Senators as participated in the matter of the convention between this country and Spain when we came to the terms of peace, to the fact that we had an understanding with Cuba, which we all believed would be carried out, that some preferential privileges would be given the United States by Cuba. Since Cuba received its independence, true to its native blood and its natural affection and its previous affiliations with its mother country, the United States has been compelled to witness a trade with Spain by Cuba exceeding that given to the United States, goods purchased from Spain exceeding those purchased from the United States, notwithstanding the contiguity of this country to Cuba, the saving in freights, and such other considerations as readily arise in the mind.

I beg to suggest that we be not rewarded with such consideration by the Philippine Islands; and I tender one of two suggestions: That the President shall have, as a condition precedent to announcing the sovereignty of the islands under the amendment designated as the Clarke amendment, the right to exact a treaty made with the United States by the government then in charge of the Philippine Islands that shall give to the United States the right to trade with the Philippine Islands to this extent—that no tariff duties shall be levied upon any imports or shipments from the United States. In this manner, by exempting us from these customs duties, we will to some small extent recover some of the vast millions we have expended, out of a noble spirit, in behalf of these islands. We will have encouraged the trade and met the objection urged by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT], who, in as full a manner as it could be presented from that point of view, disclosed the benefits of the trade feature.

Mr. President, I desire to avoid the penalty that was visited upon us by Cuba. I desire to assure to the United States the rights that I feel she has at this time the privilege of exacting.

Having stated my purpose with regard to the first amendment, I beg now to invite the attention of the Senate to the second.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, before the Senator passes to the second amendment, may I ask him a question?

Mr. LEWIS. Surely; I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Do I understand from the Senator that he proposes to have an agreement made with the Philippine Islands by which no duties of any kind shall be exacted upon goods sent from the United States into the Philippines, but that the United States shall be left free to impose such duties as it chooses upon goods imported from the Philippine Islands into the United States?

Mr. LEWIS. I will say to the Senator that such was in my mind. I realize that reciprocity in these matters is just. Therefore it will be observed that the amendment proposed by me leaves it open to the President of the United States to give such terms as in his judgment may be appropriate. I decline to make an amendment of penalty, such as their failure to enter into this treaty being sufficient to avoid the announcement of the proclamation. The amendment is left so that such provision as suggested by the Senator, if it is then deemed wise by our Government to concede, may be given without any inconsistency with the language of the amendment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Now let me ask the Senator a further question: Do I understand him to say that we had some such arrangement as that with Cuba?

Mr. LEWIS. We had no treaty of the kind suggested by the amendment. We had a trade arrangement with Cuba by which we were to get certain preferential privileges; and these, I think, were extended for a certain length of time. Since then, by virtue of the duties they levy upon us and the different burdens upon us, we have been unable to compete even with Spain.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But that is reciprocal, is it not?

Mr. LEWIS. In sugar only.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Well, but no matter. We agree to admit to this country, under a differential duty, Cuban sugar, which is their chief product, and tobacco, under an arrangement by which we reduce our tariff duties 20 per cent, and in consideration of that the Cuban Government agrees to admit

our products with a like reduction from the tariff duties. That is a reciprocal arrangement; but, as I understand the Senator, he proposes in this case to put the entire burden upon the Philippine Islands, and that the United States shall not reciprocate in any particular whatever.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah, with the sagacity and ability that characterize all his efforts, may tender an amendment to meet the point to which he alludes. For myself, I am very frank to state that I felt that this was due us in return for the vast expenditures we have contributed to the Philippine Islands, and it is no injustice to the Philippine Islands to ask that they grant it now in consideration of the many advantages heretofore obtained from us. But if it shall seem wise to the President, when the time comes to carry out such a plan, to tender that reciprocity, the amendment is in no wise inconsistent with it.

Mr. WEEKS and Mr. CLAPP addressed the Chair.

Mr. LEWIS. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts, who first rose.

Mr. WEEKS. Before the Senator passes to his second amendment, I desire to refer to the discussion which he has just been offering, relating to the trade of a dependency. Undoubtedly it is true that the trade of Cuba, which was established with Spain, naturally continued in the same channel, where it had been established and where the goods were known. Is not that probably the reason why Spain acquired or retained so much of the trade with Cuba, rather than the fact that Spain was formerly the mother country of that island?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, it may be that the previous associations which wedded Cuba to Spain have had material influence in producing the result to which I allude. I am seeking to avoid some of that, I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts, by suggesting a method that makes the price list less than that of Spain in the Philippine Islands as an inducement to trade with the United States.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President.—

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAPP. I rise not in any spirit of criticism, but for an inquiry, as I have not kept much trace of the tariff legislation of Cuba since the so-called Cuban reciprocity treaty. I will ask the Senator if Cuba has a tariff rate preferential to Spain and discriminating against us, having in mind that treaty?

Mr. LEWIS. I am compelled to inform the Senator I have no knowledge on that subject. I am giving my conclusions drawn from the figures of imports, and I have no knowledge whether any preceding preferential treaty with Spain exists or not.

Now, Mr. President, not desiring to occupy the floor and to delay a vote, I have tendered my reason for the first amendment. If it shall be adopted it will be unfair that the second amendment shall be. If the first shall not be adopted, then I tender the second, which is that if we are to have duties laid against us and have the discriminating relation by which our trade must compete with the trade of the world in the Philippine Islands, measured by the wages paid and the other conditions which we know surround the trade of Europe as it can be made with the Philippine Islands, then, I submit, we ought to be permitted some form of compensation from the new government returning to us some of the moneys which we have advanced in behalf of the Philippines. The amount and the method of payment I leave to the President to be negotiated at the time of the announcement of the proclamation. Such is the subject and spirit of the second amendment.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President.—

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator from Illinois leaves the determination of the amount to the judgment of the President, and it might be one dollar or eight hundred million dollars, according to his statement as to the amount of expenditures. Would the Senator feel free to express to the Senate his view as to what would be equitable under all the circumstances?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Ohio that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] this morning in his observations brought attention to one of the confusing elements, and that is the contradiction in the amount of money we have expended on the islands as distinguished from the amount we have expended for our military support in suppressing insurrections in the islands. I would leave to the President of the United States to charge against the islands only such sum as in equity we would seem to have contributed to the islands, but not charge them the full sum we expended, which might also include what we expended in suppressing insurrection. Such was my object in leaving that in the manner suggested by the amendment. I could not state any exact figure, answering more substantially, for that would have to be evolved from the books of the insular commission, which are

not at my service. I have answered the Senator to the best of my ability.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator go back to the first proposed amendment. I wish to inquire of him in reference thereto, whether he has any information as to the proportionate amount of the present revenues of the Philippine Islands that are derived from duties on imports.

Mr. LEWIS. Of all imports over the world?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS. I am not able to give the Senator the reply. I must inform the Senator that in my personal examination of the subject on a visit to the Philippine Islands I watched it, such as a "looker-on in Vienna" might, and I observed that the form of customs levied there is levied by the United States and not by the Philippines, as probably the Senator is aware, and reported to the United States as coming to the Philippine Islands from different countries. I have no memory at this time as to what they are in toto and can not reply to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. I have the impression that they import now from our country the greatest amount of goods coming into the islands.

Mr. LEWIS. I think the Senator is fairly accurate.

Mr. WALSH. So that one-half of the revenue derived by the country through customs will come from imports from the United States. That, I imagine, would be a very considerable source of revenue. The islands would be impoverished, would they not, by the operation of this amendment?

Mr. LEWIS. I invite the Senator's attention to that which I believe to be the existing fact, that the reason why so large a quantity comes from the United States is that the United States is buying from itself. United States officials are in power there; United States families live there; the United States has certain industries established there. But I apprehend when the islands have gone from our sovereignty and come in the hands of those who, for many reasons, feel very kindly toward us, but from racial distinction have lines of industry by virtue of previous relations, the trade will go elsewhere, because there will be none of the inducements to have the trade which previously existed. Such is my view.

Mr. WALSH. That is what I am afraid of. Would not the future operation of this amendment be to induce the Filipinos to establish trade relations with some other country so that they might derive revenues for the sustenance of their Government?

Mr. LEWIS. I answer the Senator that is a most pertinent inquiry, and it would arise naturally, if not for this conclusion—that in the absence of duties charged against us we would have to undersell some competitors and make it an inducement to the Filipinos to purchase from the United States.

I feel I have manifested to the Senate the object of my amendments, and further amplification therefore would be useless.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, we went into the Philippine Islands and took possession of the country of the Filipinos against their will. We whipped them in order to take possession, in order that they might remain quiet in our possession, and now we propose to penalize them for that much of their history.

Mr. President, this penalization is in two forms as presented by the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS]. In the first place, we deprive them, if his amendment is adopted, of a prime and necessary source of revenue. We deny them the right to levy an import duty, even for revenue purposes, upon products coming to them from the United States. If we do that, we virtually deprive them of all revenue from import duties, because they can not get along in the family of nations except upon the theory that they treat all nations equally. There will have to be with them, as with all other people, a favored-nation clause. If they permit the products of the United States perpetually to reach their shores without levying any revenue upon it, they are either not an independent nation, capable of making equal treaties with all the world, or, if they are, they consent to the surrender of all revenue duties.

The second amendment would penalize them by subjecting them to a tribute or an indemnity for what? Unless it is because that, without their invitation or their consent, we conquered and whipped them, I do not know what the indemnity or tribute would be for.

It is true that we spent a great deal of money there. It is true that very much of that money went to their benefit as well as to our own. It is true that we have educated a great many of them, built a great many roads—dirt roads and railroads—and that the United States has partially paid for a great many of these benefits to the Philippine people; but in the meantime we were enjoying sovereignty there, and to levy a tribute upon a people because you—of your own will and purpose, not

theirs—those to assert and exercise sovereignty is rather an unprecedented thing.

But my main objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois goes beyond all that. We have witnessed this morning a queer run from ultra altruism to this proposition. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] a few moments ago wanted us to give them \$20,000,000 for educational purposes, when heaven knows \$20,000,000 expended for education in certain parts of the United States would do not only us but the world very much more good. Now we go to the other extreme.

But even all that does not constitute my main objection. I do not want to say a thing about parties in connection with this, and yet to a certain extent I must. There are a lot of us, mainly Democrats, who have been fighting for 20 years nearly to get a majority in both Houses of the National Legislature, so that we might undo what we regarded the wrong that was perpetrated by this Government when it took possession and kept possession of the Philippine Islands, a wrong not only to the inhabitants of the archipelago but a wrong to our own institutions, our own traditions, and our own ideals.

When after 20 years we have succeeded in getting a majority in both Houses so that we may turn those people loose, so that we may let them go, to use the Biblical language which was used regarding the children of Israel under Pharaoh, there comes a proposition that we shall let them go only upon the condition precedent that there shall have been a treaty executed between them and us guaranteeing freedom of trade, and so forth and so on, under the second amendment, a further guaranteeing payment beyond what we regard as a fair amount of money as indemnity, if you choose to so call it; or as tribute, if you choose to call it that.

After 20 years we have gotten to a point where a majority can let them loose, can let them go; and now we are faced with a proposition to put it in the power of one-third of the United States Senate to refuse to let them go. After 20 years of work, just as we approach the promised land and look down over it and see what we have been yearning for, we will be placed in a position where one-third of the Senate can block our hope, block our further travail, and totally destroy our project of granting these people their independence.

Ah, some one says that the Senate of the United States would not act in bad faith in refusing to vote for the treaty. My reply is that it would not be in bad faith, because I would not vote for a treaty, speaking as one, which put a tribute upon those people equal to one-half even of the amount of money that the United States Government has spent in the Philippine Islands, neither would I vote for a treaty which would deprive them of the right of sovereignty to collect the revenues upon import duties.

Now, treaties can be entered into between them and us if we are friendly in spirit with one another after we part company, under which by reciprocal arrangement we may make terms that will adapt themselves to the best interests of the commerce of both countries. But that ought not to be mixed up with this prime question of giving those people independence. If you are going to give them independence, give them independence with sovereignty attached to it, not independence with a string that would bring about every year the possibility of friction; that would lead to renewed war with those people and possibly a renewed conquest.

For us at the last moment, when we have what we sought within our grasp, to consent to leave the consummation of our hopes to one-third of the Senate instead of to a majority of both Houses, to leave ourselves where we must have two-thirds of this body, seems to me to be suicidal from the standpoint of the policy which we advocate. It would not be in bad faith for a single Senator on the other side or this who is conscientiously opposed to Philippine independence to vote because of that against a treaty which would put that independence beyond question. If I were conscientiously opposed to the independence of the Philippine Archipelago, if I were conscientiously in favor of the proposition that our duty to God and man called upon us to remain there, then I would not vote for a treaty which had been made a condition precedent to their independence and thereby accomplish a thing which I believed to be radically and fundamentally wrong. I would use every legitimate instrumentality to defeat their independence, if I honestly thought that their independence was bad for them and bad for us, as some Senators, equal in honesty and sincerity, do sincerely believe. So I hope this amendment will be defeated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the first amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS].

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the second amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I call up the amendment which I offered on page 30.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 30, line 16, before the word "treaty," insert the word "or"; in the same line strike out the words "title, right, or privilege of the United States is involved" and insert "of the United States is involved, or where any title, right, privilege, or immunity is claimed under the Constitution, treaties, or laws of or commission held or authority exercised under the United States, and the decision is against the title, right, privilege, or immunity especially set up or claimed by either party under such Constitution, treaty, statute, commission, or authority."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I have already discussed this amendment, and I do not care to discuss it further. I will ask the Senator from Nebraska whether he has considered it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will say that such examination as I have given it has indicated that it is a perfectly proper amendment. I do not know that it is necessary. My impression is that the language in the bill, which is the language in the organic act, has been operating successfully, and, possibly, it has been construed, but I can see no reason for opposing the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. CLAPP. I ask the Senator if the amendment is designed to give an appeal where the court has denied a right claimed under the Constitution or laws of the United States?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My amendment deals with a case where the title, or right, or privilege, or immunity is claimed under the United States or under the Constitution or laws of the United States.

Mr. CLAPP. When it was up before I suggested that we permit an appeal, whether the right was denied or granted. We find in this country a great deal of embarrassment growing out of our present law, which only allows an appeal where rights are denied. There is a tendency to grant the right rather than to face an appeal.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think there has been any complaint about that with reference to this phase of it. The Senator states that where a statute has been held to be constitutional complaint has been made that no appeal is allowed in that case.

Mr. CLAPP. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The language which is now in the organic act will admit of an appeal in that case, because it is not worded the same as the section with reference to an appeal from the Supreme Court.

Mr. CLAPP. I did not hear the amendment as read, and that is why I asked the question.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The language, with my amendment, will be:

That the Supreme Court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to review, revise, reverse, modify, or affirm the final judgments and decrees of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands in all actions, cases, causes, and proceedings now pending therein or hereafter determined thereby in which the Constitution or any statute or treaty of the United States is involved.

Down to that point it will cover the matter which the Senator has in mind. That will allow an appeal, whichever way the decision is. It is only necessary that the Constitution shall be involved, it makes no difference how the question shall be decided. Now, when we come to the second branch of it, "or where any title, right, privilege, or immunity is claimed," then the decision must be against the right, title, or immunity in order to allow the appeal. I think that should be so.

Mr. CLAPP. I think not, Mr. President. I know a great deal of complaint has been made for several years and very able articles have appeared on that subject from prominent lawyers throughout the country. I have had letters from them complaining that there is a tendency under such a provision to grant the right, in other words, to hold the act unconstitutional, thus defeating an opportunity to secure an adjudication in the Supreme Court.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I agree with the Senator about that, but that proposition is not involved in this amendment. Under this section, as it will be when amended, an appeal will be allowed where the constitutionality is involved, no matter what the decision may be.

Mr. CLAPP. There was such confusion I did not hear the Senator's amendment read, but as I read it now from the print I see it is as the Senator states.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I will ask the Senator from Nebraska if he has any objection to the change in wording that I suggested on

page 5. It does not alter the bill, but I think makes the wording better.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the change suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts is entirely proper.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 9, after the word "denomination," insert the words "sectarian institution," and in line 12, after the word "dignitary," strike out the words "or sectarian institution."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be agreed to, without objection. If there are no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, if this is the proper time to do so, I desire to reserve the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] and all proposed or offered amendments thereto for a separate vote when the bill goes into the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has made certain amendments to the bill. The Senator from Nebraska reserves what is known as the Clarke amendment for a separate vote. The question is on concurring in the other amendments.

The amendments were concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. For that I offer the following substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert as a substitute the following:

That not less than two years nor more than four years from the meeting of the legislature provided for in this act the President shall withdraw the sovereignty of the United States from the Philippine Islands, except such necessary portions thereof as he may select for naval bases or coaling stations. He shall, however, before completing the final steps of this withdrawal, require of the Filipinos the establishment of a stable government, republican in form, and based upon the consent of the people duly ascertained at an election called by act of the legislature, approved by the President. At this election shall be submitted for approval the form of constitution recommended by the legislature, as well as the names of all candidates for elective office in the first provisional government. Said constitution shall provide that the new Philippine Republic shall fulfill the obligations of the United States concerning the Philippine Islands incurred by the treaty of Paris or arising out of the occupation of the islands, including the personal and property rights of individuals and corporations of the United States and other countries and the safeguarding of such Philippine Government loans and other obligations as have heretofore been authorized by act of Congress. Said constitution shall also provide that in all trade relations the United States shall have the benefit of the most-favored-nation clause. If the constitution is approved at said election and the provisional government created, the President shall then, by proclamation, recognize the independence of the Philippine Republic and turn over to the Philippine Government the control and sovereignty of the islands, except such naval bases and coaling stations as are above provided for. If, however, the President shall find at any time within the period of limitation provided above that the condition of the external or internal affairs of the islands or the international relations of the United States require it, or if a constitution as above provided be not adopted, he may, by proclamation, extend for the period of one year beyond the four years above provided the time for taking action under this act and thus afford to Congress an opportunity, in its discretion, to consider further the Philippine question, but any such extension of time by the President shall not otherwise suspend or nullify the operative force of this act unless Congress shall hereafter so direct.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, that is substantially the amendment which was disposed of the other day, and I move to lay it on the table.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I trust the Senator from Arkansas will withhold that motion for two reasons: First, I want to secure unanimous consent to vote upon this bill and all amendments before 5 o'clock to-morrow; second, I should like—

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I think we can vote on the bill before 5 o'clock to-day.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to have the substitute which I have offered printed.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. As I understand, it is the same thing that was voted down the other day, with the substitution of the word "constitution" for the word "treaty."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is mistaken in that. I have changed the limitation from four years and six years down to two years and four years to conform with his own amendment, and I have inserted a clause doing away with the treaty provision that seemed to involve delay and opposition, particularly from the Senator from Colorado, and inserting substantially the same provision that Congress put in the legislation which recognized the independence of Cuba, a provision requiring that the constitution of the Philippine people shall incorporate provisions for the guarantee of certain rights and the observance of the obligations of the United States in the islands. I think that is a substantial difference from the substitute of yesterday, and I think the Senate is entitled to an opportunity to see the substitute in

printed form. I trust the Senator will not insist on the gag suggestion that he makes and will permit me to ask unanimous consent for a vote before 5 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, if it had not been for the last remark of the Senator about attempting to gag anybody I believe I could not have resisted any request that he might make. I did not suppose, in making a motion—a perfectly parliamentary motion—to dispose of a matter that had been debated and defeated by a vote of more than two to one that I was attempting to gag anybody. It is simply a proposition now to consume another day, to reverse a deliberate judgment of the Senate. If it were a matter that was new, if it were a matter that had not been debated, if it were a matter that we had not all informed ourselves about, I would consent to the request of the Senator; but I believe I shall insist upon the motion to lay the amendment upon the table.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when Mr. Goff's name was called). My colleague [Mr. Goff] is absent on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

Mr. HARDING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CATRON. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). I inquire whether the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has voted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Then I withdraw my vote, having a general pair with that Senator.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. I do not see him present, and I therefore withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY]. He is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH].

Mr. JAMES. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—33.

Ashurst	Hardwick	Robinson	Swanson
Bankhead	Hughes	Shafroth	Thomas
Borah	James	Sheppard	Thompson
Broussard	Johnson, Me.	Shields	Vardaman
Bryan	La Follette	Simmons	Williams
Chilton	Lane	Smith, Ariz.	Works
Clarke, Ark.	McCumber	Smith, Ga.	
Fall	Martin, Va.	Smith, S. C.	
Fletcher	Overman	Sutherland	

NAYS—43.

Beckham	Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Reed
Brandagee	Hollis	Myers	Saulsbury
Catron	Husting	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Clapp	Jones	Norris	Smoot
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	O'Gorman	Sterling
Colt	Kern	Page	Stone
Cummins	Lea, Tenn.	Phelan	Townsend
Curtis	Lee, Md.	Pittman	Wadsworth
du Pont	Lippitt	Poindexter	Walsh
Gallinger	Lodge	Pomerene	Warren
Gronna	McLean	Ransdell	

NOT VOTING—20.

Brady	Goff	Newlands	Shively
Burleigh	Gore	Oliver	Smith, Md.
Chamberlain	Harding	Owen	Tillman
Culbertson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Underwood
Dillingham	Lewis	Sherman	Weeks

So the motion of Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas to lay Mr. HITCHCOCK's amendment on the table was rejected.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Now, Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent that not later than 5 o'clock to-morrow, this bill and all amendments thereto may be put to a final vote.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I object.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Secretary must call the roll before the request is stated, as I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has hardly been stated as a request for unanimous consent as yet.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Has objection been made?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. Does not the rule provide that the roll must be called before a request for unanimous consent to fix a day for the final vote can be stated?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Before the final request is submitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not see how the Chair would know that there had been a request for a unanimous-consent agreement proposed unless it was first submitted. The Chair is now in possession of the amendment that was made to the rule—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That is what I refer to, Mr. President.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, the rule provides that immediately upon the request being made the roll shall be called.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That is what I understand.

Mr. JAMES. That is what the rule provides. I looked at it the other day when the same matter was up.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The rule will be found on page 14 of the Manual.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is the rule:

No request by a Senator for unanimous consent for the taking of a final vote on a specified date upon the passage of a bill or joint resolution shall be submitted to the Senate for agreement thereto until, upon a roll call ordered for the purpose by the presiding officer, it shall be disclosed that a quorum of the Senate is present.

That is all that needs to be read at the present time. The Chair is clearly of the opinion that the request for unanimous consent must first be stated, and then the Chair must order the roll call.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I understand that there has been objection made by the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] to the request for unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. May I ask the Chair to read the first line again. My impression was that the rule said that no request for unanimous consent to fix a day for a final vote should be stated—

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; "submitted"—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Well, "submitted" means—

The VICE PRESIDENT. "To the Senate for agreement thereto."

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I wish to submit this thought to the Chair, for this ruling might have a future effect that would be more important than it is at present. I can easily imagine a condition where a request for unanimous consent would be submitted to fix a date to vote on a bill and amendments thereto, and there might not be more than a very small number of Senators present. If there were, for example, a dozen present, and no objection should be made, then, under the ruling of the Chair, the only thing to be done would be to call the roll.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri totally misapprehends the ruling of the Chair. The Chair has made no such ruling. The Chair has ruled that the Chair can not have the roll called to determine the question of a quorum until the Chair knows that some Senator wants to submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement; and the Chair does not believe that that can be accomplished by some Senator stepping up and stating to the Chair that he would like to submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, but that he shall rise in the Senate and say that he wants to submit such a proposed agreement; whereupon it is the duty of the Chair to order the roll to be called to disclose the presence of a quorum.

Mr. STONE. I did misunderstand the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Entirely.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, it seems to me that this discussion is all unnecessary, and that a roll call is unnecessary to disclose the presence of a quorum, when the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] has already objected.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I do not understand how any Senator can object to the granting of a request for unanimous consent before the request has been submitted to the Senate.

If I understand this matter correctly, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] did make a request for unanimous consent, whereupon I made the point of order that the roll must be called before it could be submitted. If I may be permitted a few words—I have no personal interest whatever except to see the rule observed—the rule provides in paragraph 3, rule 12, page 14, as follows:

No request by a Senator for unanimous consent for the taking of a final vote on a specified date upon the passage of a bill or joint resolution shall be submitted to the Senate for agreement thereto until, upon a roll call ordered for the purpose by the Presiding Officer, it shall be disclosed that a quorum of the Senate is present.

The Senator from Nebraska made a request for unanimous consent. The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] stated that he objected; but I do not think that the request has been submitted to the Senate, and I think the roll must be called before it is submitted.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the rule is carefully drawn with a view of giving a Senator an opportunity to inquire the attitude of the Senate before a formal submission is made. It was prepared with that in view. It was drawn by my former colleague, and after conference it was so worded that before formally submitting a request for a vote on a specific date a desire to submit the question might be stated so as to ascertain the attitude of the Senate. If some Senator stated on the informal inquiry that he would object, then the Senator desiring to submit the formal request would not make it because it would apparently be useless. That has been the mode of procedure with reference to this rule ever since it has been adopted, just as the Chair and as the Senator from Nebraska have proceeded to-day.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock meridian.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, February 4, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 3, 1916.

SECRETARIES OF EMBASSIES OR LEGATIONS.

CLASS 4.

Francis White to be a secretary of embassy or legation of class 4.

CLASS 5.

John Heath to be a secretary of embassy or legation of class 5.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Joseph T. Lyons to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 4.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Louis McC. Nulton to be a captain.

Lieut. Commander Mark St. C. Ellis to be a commander.

Ensign Thomas Moran to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Ensign Donald Boyden to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Albert Soiland to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps.

George B. Corcoran to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps.

Lieut. Charles W. Early to be a lieutenant commander.

Lieut. Wilson Brown, jr., to be a lieutenant commander.

Ensign Elmer De L. Langworthy to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Ensign Jefferson D. Smith to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Ensign Lawrence P. Bischoff to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Ensign Earl R. Morrissey to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Ensign Charles K. Osborne to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Asst. Paymaster Charles C. Copp to be a passed assistant paymaster.

Carpenter William E. Fitzgerald to be a chief carpenter.

Ensign Hugh McC. Branham to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Ensign Roy C. Smith, jr., to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Passed Asst. Paymaster Benjamin H. Brooke to be a paymaster.

Professor of Mathematics Paul J. Dashiell to be a professor of mathematics in the Navy, with rank of commander.

POSTMASTERS.

IOWA.

Bezie I. Dee, Akron.

MARYLAND.

J. B. Sweeney, Hagerstown.

MASSACHUSETTS.

William M. Allen, Fairhaven.

MISSISSIPPI.

Hubbard E. McClurg, Ruleville.

NEBRASKA.

Louis H. Deaver, Cody.
August Dickenman, Talmage.
George C. Fox, Bayard.
Grover C. Hoback, Nehawka.
H. P. Wilson, Geneva.

NEW YORK.

John G. Armsby, Petersburg.
Arthur C. Dunning, Yorktown Heights.
Clarence M. Graves, Champlain.
Dennis P. Hayes, Tupper Lake.
Asa G. Neff, Downsville.
William G. Phippin, Red Creek.

NORTH CAROLINA.

J. J. Farriss, High Point.

OHIO.

Frederic C. Betts, Williamsport.
F. B. Biggert, West Jefferson.
O. C. Reynolds, Peebles.
Thomas N. Swearingen, Winchester.

PENNSYLVANIA.

J. L. Davis, Cherry Tree.

PORTO RICO.

Carlos F. Torregrosa, Aguadilla.

TEXAS.

Searcy B. Boulware, Hempstead.

WEST VIRGINIA.

G. A. Porter, Kenova.
M. J. Wilson, Milton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 3, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God Almighty, whom we worship as the Father of all souls, how long, oh, how long wilt Thou suffer Thy children to mutilate, murder, and waste each other under the pretext of war to preserve their national liberty and rights! Interpose, oh, we beseech Thee, Thy holy influence to quicken the conscience of the men who are behind the awful holocaust that they may realize the terrible responsibility resting upon them, that their differences may be justly and amicably adjusted by the crucial test of reason, justice, and mercy, that all the world may once more enjoy home, love, and freedom in the fruitful pursuits of peace, and all glory and honor and praise shall be Thine through Him who gave us the new and holy commandment, "That ye love one another as I have loved you." Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPEECHES BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed as a House document the speeches which have been made by the President of the United States on his trip through the West.

The SPEAKER. Why not wait until the President gets back and include all of them?

Mr. FOSTER. He will have made his last speech last night or this morning, and I will ask to include that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to print as a House document the speeches made by the President on his trip through the West and those that may be made by him.

Mr. CANNON. I hope that may be done.

Mr. MANN. If the Democratic Members will read them, I am in favor of it.

Mr. FOSTER. I think they will be read generally by the people throughout the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Reserving the right to object—of course I have no objection to the publication of the speeches by the President, but it is taking a great deal of liberty to ask to print not only speeches made but those that may hereafter be made.

Mr. FOSTER. There have been a good many speeches printed in the RECORD by the extension of remarks.

Mr. BARNHART. I think it would be proper to wait until the others have been made, and then ask permission to print them as a House document.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course it might be done by asking to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BARNHART. I have no desire to object; but it does not seem proper to give consent that speeches made in the future shall be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. FOSTER. The President made his last speech last night or this morning.

Mr. BARNHART. The Speaker put the request for speeches to be made.

Mr. CANNON. That he may make on this trip.

Mr. FOSTER. I think they have all been made now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Reserving the right to object, do I understand the gentleman's request to be that the speeches the President has made up to this time on the western trip be published as a House document?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I understand he made the last speech this morning at St. Louis.

Mr. MONDELL. I understood the request to include speeches that he might make hereafter.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the gentleman is facetious, he can object if he wants to.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not object; I think the speeches ought to be printed, but it seems to me we ought to have them printed immediately, the speeches that have been made, and not wait for future speeches.

Mr. FOSTER. We are not to wait for them.

Mr. MONDELL. I have no objection; I think they will make an excellent document on the other side of the question.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the gentleman's private opinion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 4954. An act directing the Secretary of War to reconvey a parcel of land to the Anshe Chesed Congregation, Vicksburg, Miss.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolutions:

House concurrent resolution 11.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission, in two volumes, for the period from March 12, 1914, to December 31, 1915, inclusive, together with accompanying maps, charts, and profiles, be printed as a House document and that 6,000 additional copies be printed, of which 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 1,500 copies for the use of the Senate, and 1,500 copies for the use of the commission.

House concurrent resolution 13.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound in cloth 100,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse, the same to be first revised and brought to date under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, 70,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 30,000 for use of the Senate.

House concurrent resolution 14.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound in cloth 100,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle, the same to be first revised and brought to date, under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, 70,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 30,000 copies for use of the Senate.

AMENDING HOUSE RULE.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 122.

Resolved, That the standing rules of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, amended in the following manner, to wit:

In Rule X insert a new paragraph to read as follows:

"54b. On flood control, to consist of 15 members."

In Rule XI insert a new paragraph to read as follows:

"54b. To flood control, other than appropriations therefor, to the committee on flood control."

Mr. SPARKMAN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Florida rise?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I rise to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if there will be any discussion on this resolution?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes; there is to be discussion. Let me inquire of the gentleman from Kansas as to the matter of time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What suggestion has the gentleman from Tennessee to make?

Mr. GARRETT. We are willing to go ahead pretty rapidly.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have very little time demanded on the rule itself. I suggested to some gentlemen on the other side of the House last night that I would probably have some time that I could yield them; they had asked for time in which to discuss flood conditions in their districts, and it was stated that such discussion could be had under this rule.

Mr. GARRETT. That was the statement made publicly yesterday.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a parliamentary question. I had leave of absence for two years and I do not know what was done in that time. I recall that when I had the honor to preside on this Calendar Wednesday that it was so holy—

A MEMBER. This is Thursday.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I beg the gentleman's pardon. I have been watching other matters and I have dropped a stitch. I suppose, without further remark, I ought to say that my losing track of the day is due to the sorrows of a poor old wicked devil. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Remembering the ruling which the gentleman from Illinois made, we carefully refrained from calling this resolution up on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; Calendar Wednesday was so holy that nothing could interfere with it but Calendar Wednesday business. It is still holy, is it?

Mr. GARRETT. So far. Now, the gentleman from Kansas and myself are both for this rule.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; there will be no discussion on the rule itself, I think, for I do not know of any opposition to the rule.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] is opposed to the rule.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will say frankly that I am not entirely opposed to it. I have some views that I would like to express.

Mr. GARRETT. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would say 15 minutes would answer my purpose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the gentleman proceed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for one hour.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report from the Committee on Rules. It provides that the standing rules of the House be amended so as to create a new standing committee and to define the jurisdiction of that committee. The committee to be created is to be entitled the committee on flood control, and in that part of the resolution which defines its jurisdiction it is recited that all matters referring to flood control shall be referred to this committee.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Let me finish the preliminary statement. The Committee on Rules has recognized the tremendous importance of this subject matter, and that committee has felt that there should be created a standing committee of the House which could give scrutiny and attention to that question, that committee having jurisdiction of that subject matter only and, therefore, has reported unanimously this resolution with the recommendation that it pass. I yield now to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the gentleman, in view of the language of the latter part of the resolution, "54b. To flood control, other than appropriations therefor, to the Committee on Flood Control," whether it would not be well to amend the resolution, in line 8, by saying "To flood control and the drainage of swamp and overflowed lands," because "flood control" may not necessarily include a very important element, in my opinion, and that is the drainage of overflowed land.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, that would be broadening the idea which the Committee on Rules had in mind when it reported this resolution. As a matter of fact, I should assume that bills touching that question would be referred to this committee, whether it is provided in the rule or not.

Mr. BORLAND. I thought the gentleman was going to reply that he thought the words "flood control" broad enough; but if he replies that my suggestion would broaden the meaning of the words as the committee used them, then I think an amendment is certainly necessary, because it seems to me that the drainage of overflowed lands being so nearly related to flood control and yet being not necessarily directly included in it, ought to be included within the functions of this committee. There is no other committee to which that matter could appropriately go. It could not appropriately go to the Agricul-

tural Committee and certainly not to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may have been unhappy in my expression in reply to the gentleman's first inquiry, but in the latter part of my inquiry I think I made it clear. I think certainly that all bills of the character mentioned by the gentleman would be referred to this committee.

Mr. BORLAND. Then the gentleman would have no objection to such an amendment? I should like very much to urge the amendment. I do not think there ought to be any substantial objection to it.

Mr. GARRETT. I would prefer not to include those words. I think it would not be proper to include them at this time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to direct the gentleman's attention to the phraseology, more from a grammatical standpoint than anything else. I have considered the rules with this new rule inserted, and find that the reading will be rather awkward. I assume the gentleman intends, so far as the last provision is concerned, to insert it immediately following "54a"; 54a begins as the gentleman will note "To matters relating to the construction or maintenance of roads other than appropriations therefor, to the Committee on Roads"; 54b would come right after that and it would say, "To flood control, other than appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Flood Control." I would suggest that in order to make it in harmony with the previous section that after the word "to" there be inserted "matters relating to."

Mr. GARRETT. If the gentleman will turn back of 54a and read the other provisions, he will find this language to which he refers is in harmony with all of the other provisions, and that 54a itself is the grammatical exception to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. STAFFORD. I direct the gentleman's attention to the wording in section 53, "All proposed legislation concerning the disposition of useless papers, to the joint committee, and so forth." Now, it is sought to make a subdivision of section 54. Section 54 is as follows:

All proposed legislation concerning the census and the apportionment of representatives; to the Committee on the Census.

The House at the last Congress incorporated a new provision, section 54a, in which it was provided that matters relating to the construction or maintenance of roads should be referred to the Committee on Roads.

If the gentleman is going to have phraseology in consonance with that subsection of which this is a part the language should be similar. To throw into this section of the rule following 54a such language, "54b. To flood control, other than the appropriations therefor, to the committee on flood control," is rather awkward in the extreme. The gentleman should certainly frame it in some language harmonious with the prefatory part of section 54a. I will ask the gentleman whether the committee considered that, because I think it is worthy of consideration.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, that was considered, I will say to the gentleman. If the gentleman will turn to page 287 of the book I have in hand now—the pages may be different—at the beginning of Rule XI it provides:

All proposed legislation shall be referred to the committee named by the preceding rule as follows, namely: Subjects relating, first, to the election of Members—

And so on. And in subsection 39 it runs in exactly that language. The proposition which the gentleman suggests was considered and it was thought that we had adopted the simplest and plainest language that could be adopted.

Mr. STAFFORD. The only criticism that can be lodged against that position is that in the sections following section 37 there is language that does not conform. If that were the rule throughout, the position of the gentleman might be well taken, but in section 54 and section 53 there is adopted different language. Those sections begin with the phrase, "All proposed legislation concerning." Now, section 54a, which the gentleman reported, adopts new language, "To matters relating to the construction and maintenance of roads." To be in harmony with that I insist the gentleman should follow that language, otherwise there is nothing to connect it except that at the very beginning. Here we have interposed a section which has been disjointed by the intervening language that varies with the original phraseology.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, with all possible deference to my friend, who I know studies these matters very carefully, I do not think there will be any trouble about the meaning of this rule if it be adopted.

Mr. STAFFORD. There would be no question about the meaning, but it will be very awkward.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARRETT. I will.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I notice the rule provides for a committee on flood control. I have listened to the gentleman's explanation of the rule, but I do not think he went sufficiently into detail to give the House full information as to what he thinks constitutes flood control. I will illustrate the question by stating what I have in mind: For instance, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors at present has charge of the Mississippi River for all the purposes of navigation.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I assume the discussion now going on on the other side of the aisle is of importance to the House and I should like to hear it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, within certain limitations the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House has had charge of the improvement of the lower Mississippi River, appropriating large sums of money each year, and the language appropriating these amounts is always so guarded as to confine the improvement of the river to the building of levees, to protect against floods, of course, and for the purposes of navigation. What I want to ask is, What effect would this rule, if adopted, or this amendment to the rules and the appointment of this committee under it, have on the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors over that class of work?

Mr. GARRETT. I should say, Mr. Speaker, that bills relating to flood control would be referred to this new committee if the rule be adopted. I do not think that those bills which refer to the question of the navigation of the Mississippi would be referred to this new committee, but that they would be referred, as they have always been since the Committee on Rivers and Harbors was created, to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then the gentleman is of the opinion that if we make an appropriation, as we are likely to do, for the improvement of the Mississippi River below Cairo, using the same language we have been using heretofore, providing that the amount shall be expended in the building of levees and the revetment of banks, and so forth, so far as, in the opinion of the Secretary of War or Chief of Engineers, may be necessary for the purposes of navigation, it would not be subject to a point of order if this committee be created?

Mr. GARRETT. I think not; that is my personal opinion.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. GARRETT. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman has stated what the rule proposed to do. Now, will the gentleman state why it is proposed to do that? What is the reason for taking part of the jurisdiction away from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and creating a special committee?

Mr. GARRETT. Because of the realization of the fact on the part of the Committee on Rules that there are aspects of the question of flood control which are not related to either navigation or commerce.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I do.

Mr. STERLING. I would like to get at the idea of the gentleman as to the duties of this committee. The same question may have been asked by some of those other gentlemen over there, but I have not been able to get any information. Does this relate to the prevention of floods and matters pertaining to the avoiding of floods or does it pertain to matters of relief in emergencies such as exist at the present time in some parts of the Mississippi Valley, or both?

Mr. GARRETT. Of course it would pertain to both, and, having no appropriating power, I should say this committee could not do much on the question of immediate relief.

Mr. SHERLEY. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. To what committee would the power to appropriate on matters authorized by this committee go?

Mr. GARRETT. To the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SHERLEY. On what theory is that advanced? The present Committee on Rivers and Harbors has appropriating power over this subject matter. Now, you do not take that away by any express statement.

Mr. GARRETT. What I mean is that if this committee which is thus created should bring in a bill and that bill should be enacted into law providing for a continuing contract, that would necessarily, under the rules of the House as they now stand, go to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am just trying to get the facts that are involved in this proposition before the House. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman, but I think that statement ought to have been made. Now, going back to my previous inquiry, is it not true that every committee of the House, dealing with any

particular subject matter, has to necessarily deal with a lot of things that are collateral to it, and that the reason advanced would apply to practically every big committee's jurisdiction?

Mr. GARRETT. That is an abstract principle.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I desire to ask the gentleman if the Irrigation Committee could not take care of nearly all the items that are presented, for the reason that these dams and ditches on the heads of all these streams could hold the water and the ditches in the Irrigation Service could keep the water cut off the swamps on the lower part of the river?

Mr. GARRETT. I do not think so, Mr. Speaker. I do not think the subjects are related at all.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If the gentleman will permit me to make a statement there, I have in mind one great project in the Indian Service, known as the Yakima irrigation scheme, under the supervision both of the United States Government and the Indian Service—the reclamation laws of the United States. The two matters can not be separated. You have two committees at work on the same reservation, one putting water on the upper part of the reservation, flooding the lower part of the reservation, and one now making appropriation to take the water away from the lower part of the reservation.

Mr. GARRETT. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I presume it will be impossible to have a committee whose jurisdiction with some other committee of the House might not at some time seem to cross. But I do not think that the Committee on Irrigation could possibly deal with the questions that are presented and that will be referred to the committee on flood control, if it be created.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I am aware that there are some very large rivers that would not come under this rule.

Mr. STERLING. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Just a moment. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker? I want to treat these gentlemen fairly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 40 minutes remaining.

Mr. STERLING. I would like to ask just one question.

Mr. GARRETT. Certainly.

Mr. STERLING. The Government has done considerable work in view of preventing floods. What committee had jurisdiction over that work? Was it the Committee on Rivers and Harbors?

Mr. GARRETT. To what work does the gentleman refer?

Mr. STERLING. I think they have appropriated money for building levees, have they not?

Mr. GARRETT. The levees to which the gentleman refers have always been built on the theory that they were in the interest of navigation, and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors had jurisdiction of that—that is, if the gentleman refers to the Mississippi River levees.

Mr. STERLING. I do refer to that, and many others that have been built.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will not overlook the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River that has been in existence for many years without a meeting.

Mr. GARRETT. The Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River never had jurisdiction while I was a member of it. I cut my eyeteeth in that committee, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LONGWORTH and Mr. STERLING rose.

The SPEAKER. To whom will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING].

Mr. STERLING. This rule would take away from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors the jurisdiction it has exercised in the past on the question of levees?

Mr. GARRETT. It would not take away jurisdiction of any question affecting navigation or commerce.

Now, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

Mr. LONGWORTH. That was about the question I was going to ask the gentleman. I could not hear the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors; but what I wanted to know was precisely how much jurisdiction this would actually take away from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. GARRETT. I can only repeat the answer which I made to the gentleman from Illinois, that it will not, in my opinion, take away the jurisdiction of any question affecting directly navigation or commerce.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARRETT. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is the gentleman able to state whether the adoption of this rule will facilitate or retard expenditures from the Public Treasury?

Mr. GARRETT. I did not get the gentleman's question.
Mr. FITZGERALD. I asked, will it facilitate or retard the getting of appropriations? [Laughter.]

Mr. GARRETT. I can not tell about that until the bills come in. The rule itself carries no appropriation.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask whether I am correct in assuming that this resolution was introduced on the day before yesterday and that that was the first knowledge the House had of the proposition to create this committee? Is that correct?

Mr. GARRETT. It was introduced day before yesterday, as I recall it.

Mr. TREADWAY. And I understand the Committee on Rules reports it back now and expects that the House will at once act pro or con on the subject?

Mr. GARRETT. No; the Committee on Rules reported it back yesterday. It is now before the House for consideration, and it is expected that the House will act pro or con to-day.

Mr. TREADWAY. At once?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask, Mr. Speaker, since it is a new subject, sprung so quickly, without opportunity for consideration either on the part of the committees that will be affected by it or of the House as a whole, that in deference to the Members considering the subject it might not take a later place on the calendar and be brought up at a future day? Or is it introduced with the idea that it is so important that it must be acted upon immediately?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the report of the committee is before the House. I do not know whether I can answer the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts or not. It has certainly been a much-agitated question for a long while. The Committee on Rules has considered it.

Now I desire to yield some time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL]. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I wish the gentleman would yield and take care of some gentlemen on that side, and then I will take the floor in my own right and yield to some gentlemen here.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], reserving, of course, my right to resume the floor.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman does that, will he yield to a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GARRETT. I had yielded. If the gentleman will pardon me, there are a number of gentlemen wanting time now, since this matter has risen. I wonder if we can not agree upon some time for debate now. I shall be very glad, indeed, to yield if I can, if there is any desire for time. If not, of course, I shall have to retain the floor, and move the previous question at the end of the hour.

The SPEAKER. What does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] say?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, the demand for time is growing on this side. I promised 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR], and I think we had better run on for a limited time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on this resolution shall conclude in 1 hour and 30 minutes; 30 minutes of that time to be controlled by myself, 30 minutes by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], and 30 minutes by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], and that at the end of that time the previous question may be considered as ordered.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I have requests for more than 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. What does the gentleman suggest?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I suggest an hour on a side.

Mr. GARRETT. I am endeavoring, Mr. Speaker, to arrange the time so that those who, as I understand, are opposed to the rule may have control of some time. I am perfectly willing to agree to an hour on a side.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. In just a moment, and I will yield out of that hour 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] if the gentleman from Kansas will yield 10 minutes to him.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will yield to some one who is opposed to the rule, if there is anyone on this side.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman in favor of the rule?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Apparently, then, some one ought to be represented in opposition. I want to secure some information.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is my position. I would like to get 10 minutes.

Mr. HULBERT. I desire to get 10 minutes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no control of it.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, if we can get order for a few moments—

Mr. CAMPBELL. The gentleman from Tennessee suggested an hour and thirty minutes, to be divided 30 minutes to myself, 30 minutes to himself, and 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida. I have suggested an hour, to be divided between the gentleman from Tennessee and myself, and I will give 10 minutes of that time to any gentleman on this side who is opposed to the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman's suggestion one hour from the present time?

Mr. CAMPBELL. No; one hour each.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee may have an hour, or 45 minutes, as he desires—

Mr. GARRETT. That will be sufficient—

Mr. MANN. And the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] 45 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee shall have 45 minutes at his disposal, and the gentleman from Kansas 45 minutes at his disposal, and the gentleman from Florida 45 minutes at his disposal.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I merely want to ask whether I can have 10 minutes from any one of these three gentlemen?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, if we can get order for a moment, I will undertake to ascertain how many gentlemen here desire time.

Mr. SMALL. I desire some time.

Mr. MANN. The whole House desires time.

Mr. GARRETT. I do not propose to lose control of the floor. If we can not reach an agreement, of course, I shall have to move the previous question. If we can just have a moment to see how much time is desired, I will undertake to submit a proposition. In the meantime will the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] find out how much time is desired on that side?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I modify my request to make it an hour to each one of three gentlemen, and that at the end of that time the previous question shall be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] renews his request for unanimous consent—

Mr. FOSTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think we will come to an agreement here in a moment.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this resolution may be continued for 2 hours and 30 minutes, 1 hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], 1 hour to be controlled by myself, and half an hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], and that at the end of that time the previous question shall be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] asks unanimous consent that the debate continue two hours and a half, 1 hour to be controlled by himself, 1 hour by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], 30 minutes by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN]. Is there objection?

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to know whether I can have 10 minutes out of that allotment.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman for or against the resolution?

Mr. SMALL. Against the resolution.

Mr. GARRETT. Then the gentleman can get his time from the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, my present inclination is to favor this resolution; but at the same time, in view of the circumstances, I think the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, Mr. SPARKMAN, should be given more time, and unless he is given the time he wants, I shall object.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Washington permit me to say that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] submitted a request to me for 20 minutes, and I voluntarily increased the time to 30 minutes. If the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] desires more time, I shall be very glad to try to arrange it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think the gentleman from Florida should have sufficient time so that he can yield time to any Members who are opposed to the resolution. I have no doubt that the distinguished gentlemen who have control of the time on either side will deal fairly, but at the same time I think the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] ought to have the time that he wishes. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should think 45 minutes would be sufficient. I find there are more gentlemen who wish to speak on this than I had supposed.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the debate upon this matter may proceed for 2 hours and 45 minutes, 1 hour to be controlled by myself, 1 hour by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], and 45 minutes by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN]; and that at the end of that time the previous question may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] asks unanimous consent that the debate be limited to 2 hours and 45 minutes, 1 hour to be controlled by himself, 1 hour by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], and 45 minutes by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN]; and that at the end of that time the previous question shall be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] whether in yielding time they are going to divide it impartially, or are they going to give time only to those who favor the resolution?

Mr. GARRETT. I shall yield time indiscriminately to gentlemen, whether they are for or against this resolution.

Mr. MANN. My friend from Washington goes over to the Democratic side of the House to propound that question. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hope these Republicans will compose their differences in private. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HULBERT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HULBERT] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Speaker, I should consider myself remiss in the duty which devolves upon me, representing the constituency I do, which forms a part of the commercial center of the world, located on the largest harbor in the world, dependent as it is, not upon local conditions therein involved, but drawing upon the entire country for the world-renowned supremacy which it enjoys, if I did not avail myself of this opportunity to express the sentiments of the people of my district as favoring the resolution which has been reported. I say that because in every instance when nations, States, or local communities have been stricken by floods or other terrible catastrophes, the people of New York have responded with a commendable promptness to meet the requirements of the situation.

Not so very long ago, at the time of the Galveston flood, trainload after trainload of provisions was gathered at stations established by the sympathetic people of our city and dispatched to the relief of the stricken. That has been repeated with every flood upon the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, and even in every international disaster of note.

I realize that the conditions involved in these flood times along the Mississippi Valley are so important and extensive that it is impossible for the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, owing to enormous number of matters requiring attention, to give due and adequate consideration to all the elements involved; and for the same reason I feel that it is incumbent upon this House to recognize those conditions wherever they exist throughout this land, as it expands and advances along the pathway of progress, and it is incumbent upon the House to develop accordingly proper conveniences for the administration of national affairs to meet the needs which arise under those conditions.

I should like in this connection to discuss the necessity for a similar resolution, which I propose to introduce at no distant

date, and to have referred to the Committee on Rules, relating to the harbor of New York, where from a commercial standpoint we are just as much affected as are the people of the Mississippi Valley from a humanitarian standpoint. If it were in order for me to do so, I would rise upon the floor of this House and move to discharge the Committee on Rivers and Harbors from the consideration of a bill introduced by me on the 6th of last December, and upon which no action has been taken by the committee. It was intended by this bill to cover the pending and contemplated improvements of New York Harbor. When it is realized that since the administration of Washington down to that of Wilson less than 3 per cent of all the moneys appropriated by Congress for river and harbor improvements has been allotted to the greatest harbor in the world, I hope and believe it will arrest the attention of the Members of the Sixty-fourth Congress in the same serious way as does the resolution which is under consideration at the present time. The improvement of New York Harbor is not a matter local in its nature, but it concerns the people of the entire United States, just as does the Valley of the Mississippi. It belongs to the Nation. It argues its own case, merely requiring my agency as an instrument of presentation; for truth knows no preferences. It seeks no favors and it makes no apologies. It simply demands a hearing.

Approximately one-half of the exports and imports of the United States pass through New York Harbor, and 100,000,000 tons of commerce, if apportioned per capita, making 1 ton for each man, woman, and child in the United States, accommodates every section of this country; and from the merchandise imported through the port of New York more than double the amount of duties is collected and turned into the Federal Treasury than from all other ports of the United States together. And I had almost overlooked the fact and nearly failed to mention that New York State contributed in addition thereto \$17,417,537.60, nearly one-half of the individual income tax, and \$10,221,206.65, or more than one-fourth, of the corporation income tax collected during the year 1915. Do not these facts appeal to your sense of justice in securing your favorable consideration of that which I am now about to submit? The magnitude of New York City's industrial and commercial possessions, its wealth and population, can be comprehended only by comparison. In every decade since 1840 New York has shown a greater numerical increase in population than any other American city. One-thirteenth of the entire population of the United States now lives in the New York metropolitan district. New York City produces one-tenth of the entire manufactured product of the United States, more than any other State except Pennsylvania.

The value of New York's taxable property exceeds that of Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, and St. Louis combined. New York City banks handle 60 per cent of the clearings of the United States.

New York is the terminus of all but one of the great eastern railroad systems.

Thirty per cent of the entire population of the United States and 42 per cent of all the taxable property lie within 350 miles of New York City. The population in New York City increased since 1900, 47½ per cent. New York manufactures increased between 1900 and 1910, 70 per cent. The foreign commerce of New York increased from 1898 to 1913, 131 per cent. And yet in the improvement of this great harbor the Federal Government has not only failed to keep abreast of the needs of the times but has fallen far in the rear.

I would like to put the New York Harbor situation before you in concrete form:

Improvement.	Adopted.	Appropriated. ¹	Required to complete.	Total.	Commerce.
East River.....	1868	\$6,505,203	\$13,400,000	\$19,905,203	\$1,537,239,286
Hudson River.....	1875	641,479	995,000	1,636,479	\$2,559,185,809
Harlem River.....	1879	2,068,000	1,520,656	3,588,656	582,383,757
Newtown Creek.....	1880	525,900	110,000	635,900	147,739,825
Sheepshead Bay.....	1880	44,600	44,600	144,777
Bay Ridge and Red Hook Channel.....	1881	4,421,100	384,000	4,805,100	408,459,300
Bronx River.....	1896	326,500	703,931	1,030,431	\$1,947,786
Ambrose Channel.....	1899	7,600,010	140,000	7,640,010	2,056,847,222
Coney Island Channel.....	1907	114,300	114,300	\$5,256,300
Jamaica Bay.....	1910	700,500	6,730,000	7,430,500	5,171,668
Harlem or Bronx Kills, recommended.....	1902	Nothing.	1,900,000	1,900,000	None.
		22,947,592	25,683,587	48,631,179	7,304,375,730

¹ Maintenance only.

² 22,436,151 passengers.

³ 106,263,639 passengers.

⁴ Only 14 per cent completed.

⁵ 1,178,168 passengers.

⁶ State Barge Canal not yet open.

In addition to the foregoing evidence, that the improvement of New York Harbor is not a "pork-barrel" proposition, let it be noted that the Ambrose Channel was constructed at a saving of about \$1,500,000; that the balance to be expended, under the old project, for the improvement of the East River—\$2,551,939—can be turned over to, and credited upon, the new project and will suffice to do the work required in the next five years; that the Coney Island Channel improvement was authorized upon an estimate of \$168,300, and work to date, costing only \$114,300, meets present-day needs and no further appropriations have been asked for.

You are now probably asking yourselves what it is that we seek.

In 1868 the first project was adopted for the improvement of New York Harbor, to wit, East River, a tidal strait, of which the world-renowned Hell Gate is a part, about 16 miles long, extending from the Battery to Throg Neck, separating Long Island from the Boroughs of Manhattan and the Bronx, and connecting up New York Bay with the sheltered waters of Long Island Sound, providing a double entrance and exit to New York Harbor, and establishing a marine trench, which will be more efficient in the defense of that portion of the United States, which nearly all military and naval experts agree would be the first objective point of attack, than a dozen battleships, under present conditions, and at the cost of less than one battleship. With its subsequent modifications, this project had for its object extending the depth of the channel over projecting rocks at an estimated cost of \$8,757,183.

Work called for under existing project.

Locality.	Distance by water from the Battery.	Least original depth.	Least present depth.	Projected depth.	Remarks.
	Miles.	Feet.	Feet.	Feet.	
Battery Reef.....		12.8	12.8	26	
South Ferry Reef.....		17	19	26	
Diamond Reef.....		15.7	26	26	Completed.
Reef off Diamond Reef.....		19	26	26	Do.
Coenties Reef.....		14.3	25.5	26	
Third Street Reef.....	3	15.9	26	26	Do.
Shell Reef.....	2½-4	7.5	13	15	
Pilgrim Rock.....	3½	12	24	26	
Twenty-sixth Street Reef.....	4	16.1	26	26	Do.
Charlotte Rock.....	4½	14.7	26	26	Do.
Ferry Reef.....	4½	7	24	26	
Man-of-War Rock.....	4½	+0.8	26	26	Do.
Middle Reef (includes Negro Head, Flood Rock, Hen and Chickens, and Grid-iron). ¹	7½	+6	14.9	26	95 per cent completed.
Heel Tap Rock.....	7½	12.1	20.5	26	
Hallets Point Reef.....	7½	+4	26	26	Completed.
Frying Pan Reef.....	7½	9	23.8	26	
Pot Rock.....	8	8	26	26	Do.
Shell Drake Rock.....	8	8	26	26	Do.
Ways Reef.....	8½	5	26	26	Do.
Rock off Negro Point.....	9			26	Reported completed.
Scaly Rock.....	9½				
Middle Ground. ²	10	11	17.8	26	
Reef off North Brother Island.	10½	16			
Channel between North Brother and South Brother Islands. ³	10½-11½	19	19	26	
Baretto Reef.....	11½	17	26	26	Completed.

¹ Under contract for completing removal.

² Under contract for part removal.

³ Under contract for deepening for a width of about 300 feet.

About 70 per cent of the work has been completed.

On March 2, 1912, Col. W. M. Black, United States district engineer at New York, under acts of Congress approved March 2, 1907, and March 3, 1909, submitted a report of the survey of the East River and Hell Gate (H. Doc. 188, 63d Cong., 1st sess.), in which he reported favorably upon an amendment of the project for further improvement at an expense of \$32,533,501, providing for a through channel 35 feet deep, with access to the wharves to a depth of 30 feet, and the improvement of the Harlem or Bronx Kills, to provide a short cut for boats passing from the Harlem, which will be the natural outlet for the State barge canal into the East River; and Little Hell Gate, as a means of reducing the tidal velocities and diminishing, if not avoiding, the consequent dangers at Hell Gate. The Chief of Engineers modified the recommendations of Col. Black by reducing the estimate "for the present" to \$13,400,000, which, largely through the efforts of our late lamented colleague, Col. Joseph A. Goulden, was included in the bill reported by the Rivers and Harbors Committee and passed the House in the Sixty-third Congress, first session, but failed in the Senate. Meanwhile no further appropriations have been made for the

improvement of the East River; and while there is an unexpended balance of \$2,551,939 now of the amount originally authorized, the Chief of Engineers reported in 1914 and again in 1915:

It is believed that the present 26-foot project has been outgrown by the commercial interests involved, and that further work on this project is now economically inadvisable. No estimate is therefore submitted for operations in connection with said project during the fiscal year 1917.

And I may add that nothing has been expended since 1912 upon this great waterway. And if the immediate decisive action is not taken by Congress before we are able to secure the adoption of the modified project for \$13,400,000 "to meet the present demands," it will be then as obsolete as is now the project of 1868; so that by the time we will be able to secure the ultimate adoption of the project for \$33,000,000, as recommended by Col. Black, the commercial interest involved will so far have outgrown the port of New York that it will live only in history. In fact, its commerce is being most seriously interfered with to-day, because the Interstate Commerce Commission has established differential rates against New York, and which, I am told, has diverted enormous shipments of grain and other freight through Canadian and southern ports. I do not believe that the patriotism of our people will sanction discrimination against New York in favor of foreign ports.

The report of the Chief of Engineers adds:

As a result of a careful canvass the commerce of the East River in the calendar year 1914 appears to have amounted to 46,553,605 short tons, valued at \$1,537,239,286, and that the number of passengers carried was 22,436,151.

And the fact that the 30-foot and 31-foot battleships built, and now being built, at the Brooklyn Navy Yard can only be floated in or out on high tide at the rate of one ship per day was recently called to the attention of this House by the Secretary of the Navy, who urged the immediate necessity of this improvement. But it is reported that the Rivers and Harbors Committee will not take on any new projects at this session, which settles the question, unless you gentlemen give us unanimous consent for the consideration of this matter in a separate bill or resolution.

Is there anyone who doubts that the unusual commercial importance of the East River, Harlem River, and the Harlem or Bronx Kills and their continued improvement to meet the insistent demands of the commerce of the metropolis differentiates these to a large degree from any other project; and should not, therefore, the harbor of New York be made a matter of special consideration and not included in the river and harbor bill? Let us take, for instance, the question of the improvement of the Harlem or Bronx Kills.

The rivers and harbors act of June 13, 1902, directed a preliminary examination of the Harlem or Bronx Kills, which was made and reported by Col. Mansfield on July 28, 1902, whose report was reviewed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and their report, dated November 11, 1903, concludes with the words:

In view of the great present and prospective benefits that would result, it is advisable to undertake the improvement of the Harlem Kills to a depth of 18 feet at mean low water, at a cost of \$1,899,480.

There is a recommendation made 14 years ago, and what has been done meanwhile?

In 1903 the Legislature of the State of New York adopted a project for the improvement of the Erie and connecting canals to a depth of 12 feet, and authorized a bond issue of \$101,000,000 and \$7,000,000, to which have been added by subsequent enactments \$19,000,000 and \$27,000,000, making a total of \$154,000,000 to complete the project and construct terminals. Yet while the people of the State of New York, with far-sighted statesmanship, and appreciating the necessity of this development in order to accommodate the commerce of the great Northwest and to regain that which has been diverted through Canadian ports—and upon the completion of the pending improvements of the Welland Canal even greater will be the competition to the port of New York—have expended upon the development of their interior waterways more than \$200,000,000—that is, a State having 10 per cent of the population of the whole United States have appropriated an amount equal to 25 per cent of that appropriated by the Federal Congress for the whole United States, and yet have been unable to secure the cooperation of the Federal Government in the development of this improvement of the Harlem or Bronx Kills, the importance of which can not be overestimated, because the tremendous tonnage which will be brought from the great Northwest down the State Barge Canal and the Hudson River must be diverted in order to relieve congestion in the lower Hudson River, through the Harlem River, and under present conditions boats intending to go up the East River and Long Island Sound are compelled to continue on their course down to Ninety-first Street and through tortuous Hell Gate, whereas upon the improvement of the Harlem or Bronx Kills

these vessels can cut through between Randalls Island and the mainland, making a saving in distance of approximately 11 miles and avoiding the danger of Hell Gate. Moreover, Col. Black in his report says:

It is considered that this channel would be commercially advantageous in four ways: (1) By assisting in the reduction of the excessive-current velocities in Hell Gate, by permitting more water to pass between the upper East River and the basin about Mill Rock through the lower Harlem River, instead of having to pass through Hell Gate; (2) by affording a direct and short passage to traffic between the upper East River and the Harlem and Hudson Rivers; (3) by diverting a portion of the traffic from the crooked, narrow, and overcrowded reaches of the East River to west and south of Wards Island; and (4) by increasing the circulation of water in the Harlem River south of the entrance to the Kills, thus reducing the annual deposit of silt in that reach.

Further, Col. Black says with respect to the current velocities through Hell Gate, which, through certain stages of the tide, are so great as to endanger navigation seriously, that by careful investigation he has arrived at the conclusion that if the Harlem Kills were improved, the maximum mean velocities of a mean tide in Hell Gate would be reduced by 1.1 miles per hour, or 28 per cent, for north-bound currents and by a proportionate amount for south bound, and that these results would be attended by favorable influences on navigation and sanitation in the Harlem River.

I am astounded to find that there never has been an examination and report by the engineers upon the effect of the \$154,000,000 improvement of the State Barge Canal with reference to the commercial development of the lower Harlem and East Rivers since the State Barge Canal improvement act was adopted; and there has been no action by any Congress since that time tending to effect cooperation at this point with the State authorities. I do not criticize the members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, but, to my mind, this fully illustrates the absolute necessity for the consideration of the conditions in the port of New York by special legislation and not as a part of the great and laborious work of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. The conditions at New York are such they can not be controlled by a rule adopted to govern conditions in rural localities.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I shall presently introduce a resolution to meet the needs of the situation at New York with a view to authorizing an appropriation sufficient to undertake and carry forward all pending and reported improvements of the harbor of New York in accordance with the commercial necessities not only of the present day but as the best judgment of this House can determine as to the future.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. RAUCH.

Mr. RAUCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. CARAWAY.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Speaker, representing the district I do, I shall support this measure. That district I have the honor to represent is composed of 11 counties, and a portion of every one of those counties is now under water. We have in the State of Arkansas at this time flood conditions extending up and down the Mississippi River for a distance of 72 miles, and in some places 60 miles in width and between 2,000 and 3,000 square miles of our territory is now under water from 2 to 7 feet in depth. The district I represent has 350 miles of Mississippi River front. Crossing it are five navigable streams. Every one of those streams subjects the country surrounding it to overflow. The subject of this resolution, therefore, vitally affects everybody residing in my district. For that reason I realize I shall be charged with self-motives if I urge its passage. I therefore shall say only that I intend to support it. The remainder of my time I shall devote to a discussion of the local conditions now prevailing in my State, and do this in support of a resolution I introduced yesterday asking for immediate relief.

For quite a while I lived on the banks of the Mississippi River. From the front door of my house to the levees that confined the waters of that mighty river to its channel was not greater than the distance across this Chamber. I have seen every man and woman, white and black, spend days and nights fighting floods. I have seen these waters when they were more than 20 feet above the level of the land kept within an embankment 2 feet of which were but sacks of sand. Anyone who has never gone through the experience of an overflow in the Mississippi Valley will never know what it is.

The conditions are peculiar there. I have heard it charged that we come here and ask relief when we are able to help ourselves. That statement is not true. While the State of Arkansas has been admitted to the Union for nearly 100 years—it was admitted in 1836—there was no substantial progress made in that section of the State bordering on the Mississippi River until within the last generation. It is common knowledge to all that the people who go into a country to be pioneers are usually poor. Rich people prefer to stay in that part of the country where the battles for civilization and ease have been fought and won. Within the last 15 years 75 per cent of some of the counties in my district were so subject to overflow that I have seen land of the finest quality covered with fine timber sell at \$1.25 an acre. We have paid there within that time for the purpose of building levees and digging ditches to carry off the surface water, in taxes voluntarily levied upon ourselves, a greater sum, twice over, than the original value of the land when we took possession of it. I have seen people without means other than the ownership of some fruitful soil that frequently overflowed, voluntarily vote upon themselves for drainage and flood protection a tax of \$10 an acre or more on their land. The people who own that property do not stop at that when it comes to protection of their country against floods. In Mississippi County, in my district, I know a gentleman who spent out of his private means in one year more than \$20,000 to fight floods in that county, never asked the Federal Government or anyone else to repay him a cent of this sum.

In my own town during times of distress caused by overflow I have seen practically every home thrown open to receive refugees from the flooded districts. I myself have received them until they slept four to a bed. We have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars for temporary relief for those driven from their homes by floods. This relief has been extended to all who were afflicted, regardless of race or color. It has been given freely, with the full knowledge that not one cent was ever to be returned, and there was no desire that it should be.

As I said a minute ago, ordinarily those people who are pioneers in any country, and it is doubly true in this flooded area, are people without means. They are full of energy and courage. They have gone into this section because it has great promise for the future. What they have earned in most instances they have devoted to the building of their homes and to the fight to protect them from the ravages of the rivers. They are therefore, or a great percentage of them are, poorly provided for against emergencies of this kind. The destruction of their crops and of their stock leaves them helpless, and in many instances absolute destitution and want face them. They must depend either upon private charity or upon the aid of their common country.

We have not been niggardly in providing for the relief of those who suffer disaster in other sections. I voted to extend relief to the people in Salem, Mass., when it was visited by a disastrous fire; I voted to relieve the situation of the people in Dayton, Ohio, when the floods swept away their homes; I have voted to appropriate money to relieve distress wherever it has been found; to preserve the public health and protect the public morals, and I think it therefore not unreasonable that in times like this we should look to the Federal Government for aid. We have extended it freely to all other sections and all other people. I feel certain it will not be denied to these. We are an independent people in my State. We have provided liberally for the relief of those who have been unfortunate. We have institutions where those whom nature has afflicted may be cared for in comfort, and their conditions made as pleasant as possible. We have taxed ourselves to redeem the country in which we live in far greater sums than our aggregate assessed wealth now is. We do not ask to be relieved against those burdens that are common to all sections of our country. We ask only that the Government shall in part relieve the distress of the people who have been visited by great national disasters such as this. I venture the assertion that if all the people who are now suffering and distressed from the flooded condition in my State dwelled together in one city, and such a disaster were to overtake them, it would create such public sentiment and excite such public sympathy that the Congress of the United States would rush to their relief within the hour. Then shall it be denied to these because they dwell in remote places and most of them are poor and unknown? By far the majority of these people who are at this time afflicted belong to the colored race. These have been looked upon as the wards of the Nation, but we do not now ask that the National Government shall expend one-tenth as great a sum to relieve their distress as the white people among whom they live will expend in their behalf.

We ask only that they be assisted to the extent that they may live and not suffer until this disaster shall have passed away.

I hope the Committee on Appropriations will immediately report out my resolution so that a vote may be had on it, and relief extended to those who now cry out for it.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote in favor of the adoption of this resolution. As I understand the purpose of our honored Speaker in introducing this measure, it is intended to create a committee having jurisdiction over all bills relating to flood control whether the floods occur on navigable or non-navigable streams. Heretofore all such bills have been referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, but that committee insists that its jurisdiction is limited to the improvement of the navigation of streams in order that commerce might be promoted. It is true that in carrying out this policy levees have been ostensibly constructed to confine the rivers to their channels but which have actually prevented the inundation of riparian lands and contiguous sections. This work, however, was all done under the guise of improving the navigation of the rivers for the benefit of commerce.

I come from a State where we have dry rivers and no harbors, and I want to see a committee established that will give consideration to the flood problems on nonnavigable streams. I can best illustrate the nature of the relief that the people of Arizona are seeking by recounting the damage done by the recent floods on the Gila River. I shall begin by reading an article printed in the *Graham Guardian*, published at Safford, Ariz. At least 6,000 acres of rich alfalfa land in Graham County, every acre of it worth more than a hundred dollars, have been washed away by successive floods, and if something is not done to stop this devastation even greater areas will be turned from fruitful farms into wastes of sand and boulders.

GILA RIVER OVERFLOWS BANKS.

The continuous rains of the past week culminated Wednesday in the biggest snowstorm that the valley has seen in 39 years.

The snowstorm was not all the valley had as a result of the week's rain. The Gila River cleared both banks and for a time things looked serious. The waters swept over the farming lands bordering the river, carrying away land and everything in its path.

At Solomonville it almost reached the town. It spread over William Gillespie's ranch and destroyed a new crop of barley valued at \$1,500.

Nearer here it swept over part of Walter McIntyre's ranch and carried away 40 hogs.

North of Safford the river overflowed into the lower fields of the Prina and Layton ranches. On the Thorpe ranch, which is located on the south bank of the river, the waters ran several feet deep and through the lumber house where the ranch hands lived.

On the Clayton ranch, east of the Thorpe ranch, the water covered the entire ranch to a depth of several feet. About 12 hogs were reported lost at this place Wednesday night.

About 2 o'clock Wednesday afternoon Herman Foster, Denzil Thorpe, and Claude Bledsoe drove to the Thorpe ranch in a wagon and got all the bedding and clothing out of the house and then started to save the stock.

They got 6 cows and a calf to a place of safety and saved about 30 hogs, including young pigs, out of 65.

Hinton Mullenax and several others went to the rescue of Mrs. Blanche Edwards, who lives on the ranch adjoining Thorpe's, and saved all her household goods. Twelve hogs, all she owned, were last seen marooned on an island back of the ranch house.

The river overflowed its banks all the way down the valley. The roar of the waters could be heard for a considerable distance.

At Pima it was feared the bridge would go out, but the structure stood firm against the attacks of the maddened stream. The waters finally overflowed and broke through the protection of piling and rocks on the north side of the river and east of the bridge, which had been placed to turn the current. The water found a weak spot and washed out the road leading to the north approach of the bridge.

On the Pima side the road to the approach was not damaged by the river, but was overflowed by the waters from Cottonwood wash.

About 10 o'clock yesterday morning a stream about 100 feet wide was going over the road that led to the north approach, leaving only the wood part of the approach next to the bridge.

The following editorial sums up the situation:

SAVE THE RIVER LANDS.

There is so much of the farming land going into the Gila River since the recent high water that our farmers have woken up to the necessity of taking immediate steps to stop the depredations of the river.

Acres after acres has been engulfed in this vicious stream the last three weeks, and more going in daily. Some ranches have lost from 5 to 20 acres, and the total losses will aggregate nearly \$50,000.

It is time our valley farmers got busy on some proposition that will lead to united action in the saving of these valuable lands bordering on both sides of the river. Further delay in the matter may mean that it will be impossible to do anything in the way of straightening the Gila River.

Already the river has made great headway east of town and in direct line with the railroad tracks. Some day, unless something is done at this point of the river, the old Gila will come flowing down Twelfth Street and head straight for Thatcher.

It is no wonder that every time I visit the upper Gila Valley the stricken citizens say to me, "Why is it that Congress can do nothing for our relief?" I am always compelled to make the same old answer, which every Congressman has made for

the last hundred years, that no money is spent by the Federal Government except to promote commerce on navigable streams, and that, therefore, I can hold out no hope to them.

At Winkelman, farther down the stream, four persons were drowned in the flood waters of the Gila according to the following press dispatches:

WINKELMAN, ARIZ., January 20.

Last night the river broke in around the race track in the vicinity of the James Pruitt property. George McClaine, a teamster named Johnson, and two women—a woman known only as Ollie, and Ellen Smith—were drowned. A woman named Jean Elliott was saved.

Three men floated down the river on top of a house. The house struck some obstacle and the three men went under the water, but were rescued. Charles Osborne, Bert Vallentine, and P. H. Smith were those rescued.

WINKELMAN, January 22.

The flood is entirely over here, but the results still remain. The bridge across the Gila is entirely gone. The town is entirely cut off from the outside as far as the railroad service is concerned.

The Gila has dropped, and a search has been started for the bodies of those drowned several days ago. The body of Ollie Devore, one of the women drowned, was found about 9 miles down the river.

All those made homeless by the high water are being taken care of by local people. It is expected that many whose homes are still left will return in a day or so and start to clean things up.

Continuing down the stream the floods spread destruction in Pinal County, as is shown by the following account taken from the *Arizona Blade-Tribune*, of Florence, under date of January 22, 1916:

GILA OUT OF BANKS—THE BIGGEST FLOOD SINCE 1884—MUCH DAMAGE DONE.

For the second time almost within a year the Gila River bridge is impassable, made so by extremely high waters that this time caused a tremendous washout in the graded approach on the south side of the bridge, which occurred on Wednesday of this week, and all vehicle communication with the north side of the river is at a standstill, and will be until the waters recede so the river may be forded.

At dark Wednesday evening the gap between the south end of the bridge and the mainland was fully 250 feet wide. By 8 o'clock the next morning it was no less than 500 feet wide, and the water was fast eating its way farther into the mainland, until finally the entire graded approach to the bridge was eaten away and the main channel of the river had changed from its former course on the north side to the extreme south bank and is now entirely south of the south end of the bridge and is rapidly cutting away and ruining valuable farms along the river. Just how badly farms are being damaged can not be told until the water subsides.

More than half a mile of road leading to the approach to the bridge has been badly washed out, and it will cost several thousand dollars to replace it in its former condition, and little of this work can be done until the water has fallen to a low point.

The condition of some of the Mexicans living on the edge of the mesa was most pitiable. Their meager belongings were soaked with the muddy waters from the river and their houses flooded. This was caused by the water running over into the lowland just at the northern limit of the city and being backed up by the sewer levee, which finally broke, and the water flowed through onto the Kelner lands, completely inundating that property.

To save a break in the sewer line right at the north end of Main Street a dozen or more men were kept busy for several hours, and the levee was raised a foot and a half. However, farther out, the line went out in two places, taking away a hundred feet or more of the sewer.

The issue of this newspaper for the following week continues the account of the damage:

LOCAL DAMAGE BY STORM.

While no loss of life was suffered in this county as a result of the big flood of last week, a great deal of damage to lands lying along the Gila River is reported. The greatest damage done in this immediate vicinity was the washing away of a large portion of the ranch of Juan Aguilar, which lies along the south bank of the river just east of the roadway leading to the bridge. Out of between 70 and 80 acres, Mr. Aguilar now has not more than 15 or 20 acres left, and a great deal of fencing on the remaining acres was washed away. Mr. Aguilar places his loss at \$3,000.

L. K. Drails also lost nearly half of his 23-acre ranch west of the Aguilar lands across the road.

The Kelner ranch, still farther down the river half a mile, lost fully 60 acres of land, which were washed away by the raging torrent of flood waters. This ranch suffered the loss of about 20 acres during the big flood of a year ago. At this point the land was not overflowed, but being a sand loam was easily washed out by the flood.

Adjoining the Kelner ranch was the 40-acre ranch of Mrs. Mattie L. Dart, and not more than 5 acres of this place remains. Mrs. Dart had just completed installing a pumping plant on her place, and was due to prove up on her desert entry yesterday. A house and barn on this place were saved from the flood by being hauled to higher ground before the water reached them. The land where these buildings stood has been washed away.

Across the river considerable damage was done to the Nicholas irrigation ditch and to lands on that side of the river. J. R. Treat is probably the heaviest loser, some 20 acres of his land having been washed away. It is also reported that Mrs. Watson's 160-acre ranch was considerably damaged, but no one has been over the property and it is not known just how badly this property was washed.

Emile Pierson, who lives $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles of Florence on the opposite side of the river, was in Florence Monday, and stated that his property had not been damaged by the flood, but stated that G. W. Pattee, who recently purchased the George and Adrain Pierson ranches, had lost between 10 and 15 acres.

The J. J. Fraser ranch of 800 acres, just west of Florence on this side of the river, which is now being farmed by T. E. Moody, was damaged by loss of half a mile of ditch and the washing away of possibly 4 acres of land.

The Clemans ranch at Adamsville lost something like 10 acres of land and half a mile of ditch and some fencing.

On down the river 8 miles C. M. Shannon lost nearly a mile and a half of ditch. No damage was done to his pumping plant nor to his 600-acre ranch.

The matter of repairing the break in the south approach to the Gila River bridge has not yet been definitely determined upon. Engineer G. F. Twitchell was here Wednesday but made no statement in regard to the matter.

It is conceded that it would be a waste of time and money to rebuild the approach on its former lines and that nothing short of several hundred feet of concrete work should be considered. The gap washed in the approach is fully 1,000 feet wide and to rebuild it with earth and gravel would be folly as the next big flood would be most likely to wipe it out again.

The Gila River Indian Reservation lies just below Florence, and our Indian wards have suffered great losses that they can ill afford to bear, as is shown by the following telegram that I have just received from the superintendent of the Pima Agency at Sacaton:

SACATON VIA CASA GRANDE, ARIZ., February 3, 1916.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Recent flood damage to Indian lands and canals is more than \$100,000 on Pima Reservation. Immediate relief urgent.

THACKERY, Superintendent.

That part of the valley of the Gila in Maricopa County, Ariz., known as the Buckeye Valley also suffered severe damage from the recent floods. The Buckeye Valley News of January 20, 1916, contains the following account of the flood conditions:

BIGGEST FLOOD IN MANY YEARS—RAILROADS, CANAL SYSTEMS, AND PUBLIC HIGHWAYS SUFFER BIG LOSSES.

The Buckeye Valley has been subjected to the biggest flood the past week ever known; that is, a greater volume of water has passed down the Gila River. Old-timers admit this. Several years ago the Gila was on a rampage and reached a point farther up on the highlands, but that was before the channel of the river was as pronounced as at the present time.

The water is higher, much higher than last year and damage greater. The individual loss in this valley is not very great, but the stockholders of both canals, Buckeye and Arlington, will sustain a loss greater than in 1915. The Flower Pot's Enterprise headgates, we understand, escaped damage. The water is so high at the present writing that it is impossible to ascertain just what fate the Buckeye Dam has met, but is presumed that it is entirely swept away. The canal is uninjured. The Arlington Canal suffered quite a severe loss, and the current of the river is sweeping down through their canal for quite a distance. The dam is supposed to be intact, but a new current has been formed on the north of their headgate and has probably caused considerable damage. The Hassayampa River was also higher than for several years and this flood water undermined the flume of the Arlington Canal Co. and either destroyed or badly damaged it. The water in the Hassayampa has subsided and the river is fordable.

The Arizona Eastern Railroad, as usual, came in for their share of loss from the storm. From reliable information we learn that their loss will be greater than last year. The bridge is still standing in spite of the thousand and one reports to the contrary. The approaches on both sides are washed out in numerous places, on the west side as far up as where the wagon road crosses the railroad. We have had no mail since Monday, and it is impossible to make an intelligent guess as to when mail service will be resumed. For two days the telephone line between here and Phoenix has been out, but is now in working order.

The same newspaper gives this story of a second flood:

THE AFTERMATH.

Scarcely had the News been delivered at the post office last week when word was received that another flood was coming down the Agua Frio, Salt, and Gila Rivers. By noon Friday the gauge at the mouth of the Agua Frio above the Buckeye Dam indicated that the water was within 2 inches of the mark made by the high flood of two weeks ago. The Salt did not quite reach the high mark made by the former flood, but the Gila at this point was about the same as two weeks ago, and the damage is fully as great. There is considerable snow in the mountains and the indications are that the Gila will be a troublesome stream for weeks to come.

The Valley received no mail from Thursday of last week until Monday of this week. The long-distance telephone line was also out of commission during this time, and Buckeye was shut out from the world, and apparently by the world forgot. The telephone line is now in working order, and we are getting mail semioccasionally.

The Arizona Eastern Railroad sustained further damage on their Buckeye branch by losing more of their fill leading up to the Agua Frio bridge, but the bridge still stands.

The Buckeye Canal system is in about the same condition as the former flood left it in, except that the water from the slough north of the headgate broke into the upper end of the canal and filled it with silt and sand, but the canal is uninjured, and it will be a small matter to clean this portion of the canal.

Ranchers along the Gila River suffered fully as great a loss as they sustained 10 days ago, and some greater. Mrs. McDonald's ranch, between here and Liberty, has been toppling into the river for the past four or five days; also the Slagel ranch. Monday evening the river had eaten its way to within 120 feet of the McDonald residence, and it was necessary to move the house and other buildings up to the north line of the ranch Tuesday morning. The Slagel house, tank, and other buildings were also moved.

The Arlington Canal Co. also sustained additional heavy loss. From reliable information we learn that the headgate is badly damaged, and the upper end of the canal for quite a distance is completely washed away, and it is doubtful in the minds of many whether it will be possible to reconstruct that portion of the canal that is washed away. However, when the water recedes it may be found that the damage is not as great as is now feared.

The ranch of Thomas H. Bell, just south of the C. B. Parker place, is again almost entirely submerged and the house and outbuilding have toppled over; how badly the land is washed we are unable to state, but it is certainly in a deplorable condition now.

George Schmidt, on the old Hailger ranch, met with an additional loss of land to the amount of 5 acres, making a total of 7 acres of good rich soil that has toppled into the Gila and is forever gone.

The danger to none of these properties is past. The Gila will be high for several weeks to come, falling in the daytime and rising at night. It is not the excessively high water that does the damage; the receding water appears to undermine the bank and it falls into the river, the next high water washes this soil away, and as the water recedes again it undermines the bank and another large chunk of hundred-dollar land falls into the river.

These newspaper accounts mention but a part of the damage done by floods along the entire course of the Gila, and I would have you remember that I have confined my remarks to this one stream. As a matter of fact, great losses annually occur on every river in Arizona.

Neither shall I go into the details of the flood at the mouth of the Gila at Yuma, where the water ran 4 feet deep through the principal streets of that city, and where nearly a thousand people were left homeless. The destruction at Yuma does not come within the scope of my remarks, because the Colorado has been declared to be a navigable stream. It was a levee built by an appropriation in the river and harbor act of 1892 that broke, flooding the city. I hope to obtain an appropriation to repair this levee on the same theory which justified its original construction; that is, for the purpose of confining the Colorado to its channel in order to make it more navigable. Such an appropriation for the levee at Yuma can be recommended by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and I am hopeful that they will do so at an early date, even though it is admitted that the interests of navigation are slight.

No one doubts that Congress has power to make appropriations to promote commerce on navigable streams, for we have been spending Federal funds for this purpose for over a century, but whenever we ask for an appropriation to control the floods on nonnavigable streams the constitutionality of such a law is immediately questioned. There is no greater authority on the Constitution than Story, and this is the rule that he lays down:

The only limitations upon the power (to appropriate money in aid of internal improvements) are those prescribed by the terms of the Constitution, that the objects shall be for the common defense or the general welfare of the Union.

The true test is whether the object be of a local character and local use or whether it be of general benefit to the States. If it be purely local, Congress can not constitutionally appropriate money for the object. But if the benefit be general, it matters not whether in point of locality it be in one State or several, whether it be of large or of small extent, its nature and character determine the right, and Congress may appropriate money in aid of it, for it is then, in a just sense, for the general welfare.

In one sense the control of floods on a nonnavigable stream would confer nothing but a local benefit, and, therefore, Congress would have no right to authorize the expenditure of Federal funds for this purpose. But I maintain that no part of our common country can suffer an injury without affecting, in some degree, the general welfare, and, therefore, in whatever measure the general welfare may be promoted Congress can lawfully appropriate money to that extent.

For example, take the money that has been spent in the reclamation of arid land. Congress has said that since the benefits conferred are to a large extent local in their character the Government can not properly make the irrigation works a free gift to the settlers whose lands are thus made valuable. It does, however, promote the general welfare of the whole country to have the deserts and waste places changed into cultivated fields, and, therefore, the Federal Government can, under the Constitution, loan the money necessary to construct canals and reservoirs without interest.

And so it appeals to me that there could be no doubt about the constitutionality of an act which provided that the Federal Government might loan money to landowners along a nonnavigable stream for the purpose of controlling the floods that are now destroying their farms. Certainly those who receive the major portion of the benefit should pay the larger share of the cost, but to the extent that all of our people are benefited the Government of the United States should also pay its share.

Aside from promoting the general welfare, the Federal Government has a further interest in the control of floods on nonnavigable streams. A flood rarely occurs that it does not interrupt traffic on the railroads, thus interfering with interstate commerce. Every argument that can be made for appropriations in behalf of commerce on navigable streams applies with equal, if not greater, force to the safeguarding of commerce by rail.

At one time commerce, both interstate and international, was chiefly by water, but in recent years our commerce has come to be carried on mainly by railroads. Under the Constitution Congress now exercises the same jurisdiction over these artificial highways that it has always had over waterways, although there was not a railway in existence at the time the Constitution was adopted. It certainly follows that Congress has power to appropriate money, to some extent, for the control of floods that interfere with interstate commerce by rail, and it matters not

whether the flood occurs on a navigable or a nonnavigable stream.

There is still another reason why our Government has an interest in flood control everywhere. Congress has power to establish post offices and post roads, yet there is not a destructive flood on any stream that does not interfere with the delivery of the mails. The United States, therefore, has a right to contribute something for the control of floods if the Postal Service is promoted and protected by doing so. This same reasoning would also justify such appropriations as means of national defense, because troops can not be readily moved or supplied when the rivers are in flood.

In order to arrive at a practical working basis for determining what interest the Federal Government has in the control of floods on any stream, and thus measuring the appropriations that can be legitimately made, it seems to me that this new committee must adopt a rule, similar to the rule now in force respecting appropriations by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, that no new project shall be undertaken until after an investigation has first been made by a board of engineers. The Government engineers should be required to make findings in their report which shall include the following subjects:

First. A plan for the control of floods on the stream and the estimated cost thereof.

Second. The proportionate interest that the United States has in the project, taking into consideration the general welfare, interference with interstate commerce, the delivery of the mails, and so forth.

Third. The proportionate share of the cost of the flood-protection works that should be paid by the riparian owners whose lands would be benefited.

With this data, prepared by competent engineers, available for consideration, the committee and the Congress could act intelligently in making appropriations for flood control.

I realize that there is no greater economic question before this Congress than the adoption of a proper policy for flood control, a question that affects not only the material welfare but the very lives of our citizens. It is the bounden and solemn duty of this Government to promote the safety, happiness, and prosperity of our people by every act of legislation, within constitutional limits, which Congress may deem conducive to these ends. I know only too well that the machinery of this great Government moves with exasperating slowness, but I believe that the establishment of this committee will hasten the day when real and substantial relief can be given to those who now suffer from the devastation wrought by floods. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the pending resolution to create a flood control committee bears the indorsement of our great Speaker of the House, which shows to me that it has had his thoughtful consideration. The Committee on Rules has also given it serious thought and reported it favorably to the House. I shall give it my support, although the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, of which I am a member, Mr. SPAKMAN, of Florida, may enter some objections to it. I always dislike to vote in opposition to this distinguished southerner. I shall do so in this case if he takes the view of the resolution he has indicated.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. I am sorry, but my time is short, I can not yield. Now, gentlemen of the House, and if there be members of the Appropriation Committee present—I see some present—I should like to have the benefit of their attention. I will say that down in the southeastern part of the State of Arkansas, mostly in my district, all along the Mississippi River, flood conditions there are reported to me as being horrible. My home city of Pine Bluff is located on the Arkansas River about 100 miles from the Mississippi, and nearly all the country from Pine Bluff to the Mississippi is under water, so to speak. Hundreds and hundreds of people are in destitute and in a terrible flood condition to-day. That is true not only in my district but out of my district. In the district represented by my colleague, Mr. CARAWAY, and in the district represented by my colleague, Mr. GOODWIN, similar conditions prevail. On the 27th day of January I received the first information concerning the flood and destitution through a telegram from the governor of my State. This great water that is in the Mississippi is unusual. The Arkansas River is on a rise now unprecedented in the history of that river. In front of my home city it is nearly 3 feet higher than ever known before. I have telegrams here that the flood water is backing up now into this city with alarming rapidity, which portends, I fear, terrible results.

So soon as I got information from the governor of the distressed situation I immediately visited the War Department for assistance, and was informed that no relief could be granted by the department; that the Congress of the United States in February—I believe it was—1913, passed a law prohibiting the department from sending food, tents, or clothing to sufferers of any character or from any cause. Because of my alarm and fear and seeing that prompt action should be taken and that a great emergency existed, I went to the American Red Cross Association of this city and called for relief. I was promised that they would send an agent down to the stricken district to investigate conditions. I have gotten nothing from any source up to date. It is said in the Good Book that "charity is the paramount virtue; all else is but as a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal." And now, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, in this hour of great and dire distress of our people and while the citizens of my district and below and above me are appealing to you and the Senate, who constitute the Nation's Congress, for aid—for clothing, for tents, for shelter, and for rescue boats—I hope that you will not deny them. Since I have been a Member of this Congress I have always voted for the distressed and suffering people of this Nation everywhere when called upon for relief. I remember casting my vote to help the distressed fire-stricken people in the State of Massachusetts, at Salem. The same I did last year or the year before in the great flood disaster in the Ohio River Valley. I desire to read a few telegrams that I have received. Here is one from the governor of my State:

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., January 27, 1916.

Hon. SAM M. TAYLOR,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Mr. Stone, of Watson, Desha County, just phoned me to request immediate aid from Federal Government for 500 families in that vicinity who are in destitute circumstances on account of flood conditions on Arkansas River. If anything can be done, send in haste to Burnett Landing, on Arkansas River.

GEO. W. HAYS, Governor.

Here is another from people who are marooned:

WATSON, ARK., January 29, 1916.

Hon. SAMUEL M. TAYLOR,
Congress Hall Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

We are surrounded by water all the way from 3 to 20 feet deep. About 500 families are homeless. We need immediate assistance. About 1,000 head of live stock need feed. We are cut off from train service. We have lost a lot of stock and feed. Get us assistance as soon as possible. The only way to reach us is by boat to Redfork, Burnett's Landing.

M. WOLCHANSEY,
R. A. EMERSON,
CHAS. MORGAN,
B. T. OUTLAW,
H. STROUD,
H. ALCORN,
T. J. HAEFORD,
DR. HYDRICK,

Committee.

One boat was found in the Arkansas River. That was sent down to take suffering people out of the flood. The other boats is a Government dredge boat and is disabled and can not travel, it is said. I want to impress this fact upon you. It is about a hundred miles from the city where I live to the Mississippi River. The Arkansas River to the Mississippi is leveed by the money of the people who own land within the levee districts, and they voted to tax themselves to build these levees, as explained by Mr. CARAWAY. Those levees have broken. Here is a telegram from McGehee, from S. P. Dixon:

McGHEE, ARK., February 1, 1916.

Hon. SAM TAYLOR, Member Congress,
Washington:

Levees broke at Cummins, Goree, and Douglas last night. Water covering entire territory between Grady south to Watson from Iron Mountain Railway tracks to Arkansas River. Dr. C. W. Dixon and Wallace Douglas, at Douglas, advise that immediate help is necessary. Hundreds of negroes are homeless and destitute. We want boats with 2,000 rations to come to Douglas at once. All communication cut off except telephone at Douglas. This is expected to go out at any time. Have appealed to governor.

S. P. DIXON.

I have another telegram here which I received last night from my son Dan, and you know I think that he would not exaggerate conditions. He says:

PINE BLUFF, ARK., February 2, 1916.

Hon. S. M. TAYLOR, Member Congress,
362 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Levee in front of State farm broken for several miles and whole surrounding country inundated. Towns of Gould, Pendleton, and Douglas all under water; immediate vicinity of Varner and Dumas flooded. A large number of convicts at Cummins marooned. Conditions appalling and weather intensely cold. Government boats in this river are needed for relief; their use has been denied by engineer in charge at Little Rock, saying it is dangerous for them to pass Robroy bridge. Conditions existing justify the risk. Do your best to obtain boats and all other relief the Government can afford. East end of town, from about Alabama Street to first ward school and Cotton Belt shops, under water.

DAN.

Imagine, gentlemen, the situation—people in trees, on the tops of floating houses, to escape the flood, in cold weather such as we had here in Washington last night.

Here is a letter which I have just received, written by a lawyer of prominence, residing on the Mississippi River at the county seat, Arkansas City:

ARKANSAS CITY, ARK., January 31, 1916.

Hon. S. M. TAYLOR, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Well, we are in for the deepest flood ever known. Practically all of Desha County will be under from 1 to 7 feet deep. Chicot County will get the same, and the Tensas Basin in Louisiana will be very nearly all submerged. Would not be at all surprised if we have to beg for rations.

Your friend,

F. M. ROGERS.

Mr. Speaker, this is a true story of great trouble and suffering. A friend said to me the other day, "Why can not local contributions take care of the situation?" "Local contributions?" I replied; "why, our people are doing everything they can, but it takes thousands of dollars to undertake to take care of a situation so great and terrible as the one that I have described." The locality is great and all affected. Those citizens in times of normal conditions, when the water does not come from the breaking of the levees, can and do take care of every situation that comes up; but when you find them helpless, as now, away out, 20 or 30 miles, in the middle of a flooded country that is like an ocean, you can imagine how hard and costly it is to take care of the sufferers.

I have other telegrams here, which I ask consent to insert. I have messages stating lives have been lost.

The telegrams referred to are as follows:

S. M. TAYLOR, Washington:

Send me at Arkansas City 100 Government tents; 500 families in destitute condition; need supplies at once, whole country under water here. Answer.

C. C. HEMINGWAY, Mayor.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., January 28, 1916.

Hon. SAM M. TAYLOR,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Flood sufferers at Watson and vicinity are in destitute circumstances for food and shelter, many families have had to leave their homes. Should you need more definite information wire Elbert Stone, Watson, Ark.

GEO. W. HAYS, Governor.

PINE BLUFF, ARK., February 1, 1916.

Congressman SAM M. TAYLOR,

Congress Hall, Washington, D. C.:

Between 1,000 and 1,500 people in Douglas section destitute, need supplies, result of flood. Others in this section similarly situated; need urgent. Can you get Government aid? We are starting subscription here to-night and will do what we can. Wire reply.

THE GRAPHIC.

PINE BLUFF, ARK., February 1, 1916.

Congressman S. M. TAYLOR,

Washington, D. C.:

Residents of Douglas and that vicinity in a perilous situation owing to breaks in levees in Auburn and Linwood districts. Our two packet boats unable to meet all demands. Snagboat *Arkansas* tied up here, but Engineer Dent at Little Rock states she is unsafe to make the trip to Douglas. Old river men claim she can go to Douglas without even getting into the current or channel or in any dangerous position. Twenty-five families marooned at Douglas. Would like *Arkansas* for use as houseboat if nothing better. Can you render any assistance. Lateness of this dispatch caused by promise of Maj. Dent to send boat, which this afternoon was countermanded for reasons above stated.

E. B. BLOOM,
Secretary Chamber of Commerce.

DOUGLAS, ARK., February 1, 1916.

S. M. TAYLOR, Washington, D. C.:

Levees broken in three places on both ends of State farm and at Douglas. Send provisions for 300 families and hay for stock. Thousands of acres flooded.

C. W. DIXON.
W. W. DOUGLAS.
R. E. LAKE.

WATSON, ARK., February 1, 1916.

Hon. S. M. TAYLOR, Washington, D. C.:

We the undersigned ask of you to get feed and rations on account of floods for 1,500 people and 1,000 head of stock.

A. S. TOUNE.
J. E. HARRIS.
DR. E. C. HYDRICK.
R. A. EMERSON.
M. W. OLCHANSKY.
S. L. BOYD.
BEN OUTLAW.
CHAS. MORGAN.

ARKANSAS CITY, ARK., February 2, 1916.

Hon. SAM M. TAYLOR,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to earnestly support emergency appropriation bill in Congress to make high-water fight.

DR. VERNON McCAMMON.
JOE DEMARKE.
GEORGE R. LACY.

McGHEE, ARK., February 3, 1916.

Hon. S. M. TAYLOR,

Congressman, Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your efforts on big appropriation. What is needed now is immediate relief along Arkansas River. Situation desperate at Douglas and Red Fork, and Pendleton Levee broke at Pendleton yesterday, drowning hundreds of cattle which had been driven there from Watson and other low territory. Doubtless some lives lost. Freezing weather. Suggest you obtain Mississippi River steamboat, provision same, and send up Arkansas River with 2,000 rations for Red Fork, Pendleton, South Bend, and Douglas. Upper territory can be handled from Pine Bluff.

S. P. DIXON.

ARKANSAS CITY, ARK., February 3, 1916.

Hon. SAM M. TAYLOR,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Our town inundated. All parties who are able have left the town. There is still several hundred people remaining who were unable to leave. We will be in need of assistance. Make every effort to help us.

C. T. SMITH, M. D.

Telegraph and railway facilities to flooded districts cut off—have just received the following message:

SAM TAYLOR:

Your messages of this morning to C. W. Dixon, Douglas, Ark., also one to Rice, Varner, Ark., are being held at Little Rock, Ark., account of the floods. No wires or mail trains.

W. U. TEL. CO.

Before concluding my remarks I wish to appeal to the Appropriations Committee of the House to report immediately out the joint resolution favorably which I introduced calling for \$250,000 to be paid out for the relief and benefit of the suffering people in eastern Arkansas, in the district I have the honor to represent, as also for the relief of those sufferers above and below my district. There need be no fear that this money will be expended unnecessarily, because the resolution provides that it shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War. He will take care that no money is extravagantly used, but that it shall go directly to those who are in want and in great distress; and if it should turn out that all of this appropriation should not be needed, then what is not properly expended will be covered back into the Treasury of the United States. And if our Appropriations Committee will report the resolution favorably to this House, I feel that I know that the great throbbing hearts of its membership and their disposition to do a great charity to worthy citizens and to poor suffering men, women, and children, that the resolution will be promptly passed.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the great city of Philadelphia has never been wanting in extending the hand of relief and assistance when needed elsewhere throughout the country. She has taken high rank as a city readily equipped and able to assist those who happen to suffer calamity, but the situation before us now is one that involves other questions than that of relieving distress such as now prevails along the Mississippi Valley and these Arkansas rivers, for which the gentlemen from that State have so well spoken. There is distress there, and all of us, I am sure, would be glad to relieve that distress; but suddenly, and without notice, a very important resolution is presented to the House which proposes to create a committee, not to meet an emergency that now exists but to establish a permanent new force in this House, which may not only work for temporary relief in such an emergency as this, but which will seek, in the course of time, the expenditure of vast sums of money for permanent uses.

I have no particular quarrel with the proposition to spend money for emergency relief or for permanent relief where it may be necessary, but I call the attention of the House to the fact that if we are to spend money we must also raise money. We do not raise money, when we extend relief through some newly-created committee, on the ground that those in distress live along streams that happen to be interstate or even wholly within a State. It is by improving streams for commerce and navigation that we raise revenues of the Government, and such navigable streams should be improved if we are to obtain money to relieve such distress as is here depicted.

But overnight, Mr. Chairman, a resolution comes in here which apparently takes away from the great Committee on Rivers and Harbors its duty, to a limited degree at least, of looking after the navigation and commerce interests of the country. Heretofore the work such as is now contemplated, if I understand the purpose of the new rule, has been done with appropriations made through the Committee on Rivers and Harbors working under a systematic plan, having the approval of the engineers of the United States Government. Due to this emergency, however, and because the time is ripe—although it may not be the ripest time to talk of increased expenditures

through new committees raised for special purposes—it is thus suddenly proposed to limit the work of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and give to a new committee comparatively the limited powers in recommending expenditures.

In 1879, I think it was, Congress created the Mississippi River Commission, which was to take entire charge of the work of the Mississippi River and its tributaries. That commission was not to last long, but it has lasted from that time to this, and each year increasing appropriations have been made to it through the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for the work along the Mississippi Valley. It has not been work wholly in the line of commerce and navigation. Most waterways men will concede that the Rivers and Harbors Committee has been up against the problem of making appropriations for the Mississippi and other flood rivers through the medium and excuse of commerce and navigation, much to the disadvantage of legitimate commercial waterways.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I have some of the time of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Now, it may be that the work of flood prevention, the construction of levees along the Mississippi to control the current of the river, or of any other levees on any other river, may not properly be the work of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I will not dispute that now. I believe that on one occasion I undertook by an amendment to separate the work and to take this great business of the conservation of our resources and flood control away from a purely commerce and navigation committee. But the amendment did not succeed. I am not sure that I object to the separation now, but I think there should have been some discussion of the subject, not incident to a flood emergency, but in the usual deliberative manner. I would have no objection to considering this rule if it had not come in overnight in the nature of a surprise. There is a big question here. We are confronted, for one thing, with the problem of diverting commerce and navigation money for the purposes of flood prevention. We ought not to detract from commerce and navigation.

Charges of "pork barrel" are being made in the great newspapers of the country against perfectly legitimate commerce and navigation projects. They have already suffered considerably. It has not been the fault of these legitimate projects. The attacks have been based largely upon the fact that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has been obliged at times to go beyond its ordinary commerce and navigation jurisdiction and appropriate for the construction of levees which primarily were for the prevention of floods.

Of course we all want to prevent floods; we want to prevent them along the shores of New Jersey, where the sea waves sometimes sweep property into the ocean and where men and women lose their lives, just as we want protection down in the Mississippi Valley, where floods come periodically. We want to stop floods that rush over a dam at Johnstown and carrying 4,000 lives into eternity at one fell swoop, just as we want to prevent floods that course down the streams of the Middle West, even from the Northern States, until they inundate the plantations of the South. That we want to do in a general and fair way, and I do not object to the Government contributing; but I do not want for a moment to permit this resolution to go through without a protest, if it be necessary, against the plan, if there be such a plan, of reducing the earning power of the Government through legitimate commerce and navigation and turning rivers and harbors funds over to flood prevention.

The States of the South have contributed to the building of levees along their streams, and we can not charge it up to them that in the matter of self-preservation in the protection of their own property they have not done their best. But every river and harbor bill that has come in within my recollection has included appropriations, earned in part from commerce and navigation, that have gone grudgingly for the purposes of navigation and liberally for the building up of river banks to protect private property against the ravages of flood. While we are considering this resolution, therefore, we should also remember that some important legitimate projects have been unduly postponed in recent river and harbor bills, and that the revenue-earning power of the Government has suffered in consequence. I would relieve distress, but I would not check legitimate river and harbor work in doing it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Does the gentleman from Florida care to consume more time at this point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] desires to use some time now.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker and gentleman of the House, as a member of the Rules Committee I was constrained to give this resolution my most hearty support, and I rise at this time for the purpose of speaking in favor of it.

It is my steadfast belief, based upon a good many years of intimate study and acquaintance and association and professional connection with this problem, that there is no project that can be devised by this Congress, save the one of preparation for the national defense, that is a more legitimate object for Federal aid and Federal support than the subject of flood control and flood prevention. [Applause.]

I can see, perhaps more clearly than some of those who have been Members of this House for a longer time, the questions that are about to arise because of a conflict of jurisdiction of committees, but the fact remains, gentlemen, that practically since the Government has been founded and established this question of flood control has been presenting itself at periodical times, year by year, and it is still as near unsolved as it was at the day when the first President of the United States raised his hand to be inaugurated.

It has not been settled, and it has been made a game of battle-dore and shuttlecock between the committees of this House, one saying that it did not have jurisdiction and jurisdiction being denied to another.

In my humble judgment and opinion, for which I claim no particular merit, it is time that there should be a committee that should have control of this question and at once commence to make the plans for the relief that is so much needed.

Gentlemen, while we talk here to-day, and as we have failed to act in years gone by, the lives of men and women and children have gone out, destroyed by the great floods of our rivers, and millions of dollars worth of property has been destroyed every year.

If any farmer or any ordinary business man in all the United States would handle a problem as the problem of flood control has been handled in the United States, it would be denounced by all who knew of it as being absolutely idiotic.

Now, let no gentlemen misapprehend what I have said. It shall be my course while I am in this House to endeavor to fully and properly observe the courtesies of debate and to refrain at all times from any harsh words.

But I do speak of the policy.

It is idiotic.

There is only one way the question of flood control can be handled, and that is by recognizing the fact that each year, or very often if not each year, a flood is coming down the channels of the great rivers and the lesser streams of the United States, that its quantity can be measured and estimated, and there must be left in the channel of that river a sufficient carrying capacity, within which man does not invade, to make safe the carrying away of these waters and insure their rapid exit either to the sea or the larger rivers.

This work can not be done in a day. The expense would be prohibitive. It can not be commenced perhaps at this time because of the more pressing needs for the appropriations and moneys of the country, but the demand for relief from floods goes up, and it does exist, and will not be satisfied until it is answered by relief being afforded the people from flood loss in practically every State in this Union.

It is in no sense of the word a local question. Take, for instance, the Mississippi River. It is fed from the streams up in Wisconsin, over in Indiana, in Illinois, in Missouri, Minnesota, the Dakotas, and other States, and then by the Ohio River with all its branches, until the streams from some 31 States go to make up the stream that flows so majestically and mightily to the Gulf.

In time of flood in the Mississippi River 2,000,000 cubic feet of water per second is flowing through the middle portion of the South; 120,000,000 cubic feet a minute, making a total of nearly 1,000,000,000 gallons of water every minute flowing in this stream, that spreads out through the country without let or hindrance, when there is a crevasse or when the levees break, carrying devastation and destruction with it.

It is a problem that must be met with a broad national spirit. It is one that must be met now, so far as plans are concerned. It is one that is crying out for solution, and it is one that will no longer tolerate delay while committees claim and disclaim jurisdiction.

There is not a President of the United States but has declared himself to be in favor of this policy for the last 15 or 20 years. When the great parties have met in convention each and every one of them went upon record as being in favor of the conservation of the life and the conservation of the property and the restraining of the waters of these streams, and to do less now would be to refuse to commence to discharge a duty that is apparent and insistent and plain.

Now, though we can not at this time, perhaps, proceed to do the actual work, a committee of Congress can take steps that will be the commencement of the relief that is demanded.

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman is on the Committee on Rules and unquestionably has studied this resolution. One of the main criticisms I have is as to the language "subjects relating to flood control," which go to this committee. Now, presumably legislation will be sought to prevent damage from flood. Does the gentleman understand that that includes damage to contiguous lands and, for their preservation, a reclamation of lands? Does it also include the building of levees for the purpose of preserving contiguous lands? Does it include, for instance, the construction of revetments along the river banks? Will the gentleman kindly say which one of those it includes?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. To enter into any discussion at the present time of the engineering problems that are involved, with the minute or two remaining to me, would be absolutely impossible.

The jurisdiction that is voted to this committee and will be conferred upon it, if it is established by this resolution, is for the purpose of controlling floods.

I apprehend that if the committee acts it will act in a broad spirit. I apprehend that when this provision of the resolution attempting to "control floods" will be construed, it will be construed as provisions of the Constitution are construed—broadly, and in such a way as will accomplish the purpose for which it was sought to be enacted—and, of course, the purpose for which it is sought to be enacted, upon its face and as a matter of current history, is not to relieve a temporary emergency of flooding, but to produce a condition that will relieve the recurrent floods from year to year, and thus "control floods."

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman permit another interruption?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMALL. Floods do damage to channels of rivers. Will this committee have jurisdiction of damages to channels from flood waters?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I would take it, with sincere respect to the gentleman, that my friend is either opposed to the resolution or is an extremely strict constructionist, for the construction which he places upon it would be strained and unnatural and, it occurs to me, entirely unreasonable. The damage to channels from flood waters might possibly be considered, but it would not be the main power of the committee but only an incidental one.

No. The construction that should be placed upon this, unless common sense has departed from us, is in the face of emergency, when life is being lost and property is being destroyed and welfare is being threatened, to take those steps, or to commence to take those steps, that will afford an ultimate control of floods and their prevention.

It is idle to say that it can not be done. The solution of this problem affects nearly every State. It concerns us all. It concerns the good people of Illinois who have honored me with a membership in this House. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Merely for the purpose of making further reply to the questions asked me, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPARKMAN addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GILFIELD].

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that I am in favor of this resolution, but I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this resolution. I am not in favor of it because of any emergency that exists, but I am in favor of it as a permanent committee of this House. There is an urgent necessity for just such a committee. I live on the Mississippi River, and this committee is of first importance to all those who live along its banks. If the jurisdiction of the committee was confined alone to the leveeing of the Mississippi River for the prevention of floods, the committee would have ample to do.

The Mississippi River drains the waters of 31 States and a small portion of Canada. Probably about one-half of the entire territory of the continental United States is drained by this river and its branches. All of this immense volume of water coming from this enormous territory goes through what is known as the lower Mississippi. In recent years, probably due very largely to the cutting out of the timber in this territory, floods have become frequent and have from time to time caused great loss of life and property and great distress. Before levees were built in the seasons of floods the Mississippi from St. Louis down just spreads over the whole valley. This valley is one of the richest territories in the world; indeed, no other valley can be compared with it. Before levees were built, because of the annual overflow, the lands were of little value; but not long after the Civil War a system of levees were begun, confining the waters of the Mississippi and protecting the lands along its low-water shores. It has taken a long time to build these levees, and they are not yet complete. The Government spends annually several million dollars in building and maintaining them, and the several States through which they pass contribute many millions more for a like purpose. Under this dual system much has been accomplished; yet, as lands are cleared up above, the floods become much larger, and from time to time these levees in weak spots give way, often causing loss of life and great loss of property.

Appropriations for the building and maintenance of these levees are provided for by the Rivers and Harbors Committee and are included in the annual rivers and harbors bill. Ordinarily a lump sum is appropriated and turned over to the Mississippi River Commission for allotment, and that commission allots as it sees proper and in connection with allotments coming from the various levee districts up and down the river.

It is easy to see, therefore, that this method of dealing with a great national question, like the question of the control of the flood waters of the Mississippi River, is, to say the least of it, a very haphazard one. There ought to be a general, uniform plan to control the flood waters of this great river and for the protection of the people and lands along its banks. The task ought to be performed methodically. It ought to be taken up as a separate project, just as the Panama Canal was constructed, and levees should be built and maintained which are efficient for the purpose. There is no reason whatever why there should be floods along this river. Competent engineers have testified that if the Government would expend its money with a definite fixed plan and purpose within a term of five or six years these levees could be constructed so as to control absolutely the flood waters of the Mississippi, and at the same time give absolute protection to all that vast territory of rich lands over which without levees these waters would flow.

In determining the question of flood control in the Mississippi River there are other questions to be considered at the same time. One of these is the proper care and protection of those who live within the confines of these levees, and the other is the rights of riparian owners.

All of these questions would be under the specific jurisdiction of this committee, and it is, in my judgment, of vital importance to all those States that border on the Mississippi River. For these reasons I am heartily in favor of the bill.

I feel that I ought to say to the House that I can consider this question without reference to local conditions. Two years ago and four years ago I went before the Rivers and Harbors Committee and endeavored in every way I could to get assistance of Congress in aiding the city of Memphis in protecting itself from the flood waters caused by the building up of levees on the Arkansas side. Before the building of these levees, Memphis was high and dry, but the erection of levees caused the water to rise higher on the Tennessee side, with the result that after a number of years the upper part of our city was flooded; and two or three years ago we had a flood that greatly injured our water system, our gas system, our street car service, and caused thousands of people to be run out of their homes. It was estimated that the loss of property was over a million dollars in that one flood to the citizens of Memphis. These

facts were all brought before the committee, but Congress would not help us. Thereupon the city of Memphis bonded itself for \$1,500,000 and has erected within its borders for its protection a concrete levee that fully protects. These floods were thrown upon Memphis without any fault of her own. They came from some twenty-odd States of the Union. Memphis ought not to have been compelled to have spent this money for her own protection. But she has done so, and we are now protected, and for this reason I say that it is with no specific selfish reason that I favor the establishment of this committee. I do so because I believe it is the initial step of a practical, methodical, and sensible system of confining the flood waters of the Mississippi River.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I think the serious objection to this resolution is the fact that by reason of its brevity it is ambiguous and will give rise to confusion in construction and to conflict of authority in committees. That is quite evident from the queries propounded to the last gentleman who spoke, Mr. SPARKMAN. There is not a proponent of this resolution who will undertake clearly to define the jurisdiction of this committee. Is it intended to take away jurisdiction from the River and Harbor Committee as it exists at present? That committee, according to the rules, has jurisdiction as follows: "Subjects relating to the improvement of rivers and harbors." By custom and practice it has been assumed that that committee has jurisdiction of all subjects of legislation affecting the navigability of rivers and harbors and improving them for commerce.

Does any gentleman say it is the purpose of this rule to diminish the power of the River and Harbor Committee as it at present exists? If so, I would like for him to say so. If not, then perhaps it is intended to give this committee jurisdiction of subjects of which no present standing committee has jurisdiction. Then, what are the subjects? The language used here are two words, "flood control." The complete rule as amended would read, "Subjects relating to flood control other than appropriations therefor, to the committee on flood control." What do gentlemen intend to convey by the words "flood control?" Presumably to prevent damage arising from floods. Damages to what? Do they mean to riparian lands and contiguous sections, to preserve them from devastation of flood waters? Is that their meaning? We have had an agitation during the recent years asking Congress for legislation to aid in the reclamation of lands subject to overflow through drainage. Is it intended under the words "flood control" that this committee shall have jurisdiction of legislation seeking to extend aid in the drainage of land so as to prevent flood waters from going over them, impairing the fertility of the land and destroying the crops? If so, why not have said so? Why have used two words the meaning of which no Member is able to explain?

The chairman of the River and Harbor Committee [Mr. SPARKMAN] asked the gentleman from Tennessee having charge of the resolution if it was intended to give this committee control of any legislation affecting the navigability of rivers, and he said, "No."

Then why not have made the rule definite and said so? The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] grew eloquent and made a fine speech about the importance of flood control, which we all admit. The devastations of flood waters, both local and along those rivers which are interstate in their character, and along which flows such vast volumes of water as to be a constant menace to property and life, arouse the sympathy and invoke the aid of every Member.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Just one minute. But while we all admit the dangers of flood waters and, in so far as we may, would seek to avert them, if it was the purpose to protect riparian lands or to aid in drainage, why not have made it definite and said so, so that we might know what was the jurisdiction of this committee. I now yield.

Mr. EMERSON. Then the gentleman favors flood control, does he?

Mr. SMALL. What is flood control, please?

Mr. EMERSON. I ask the gentleman if he favors flood control—the control of these waters that devastate the land and destroy the crops.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I have always had great sympathy with those localities which were subject to damage from these floods. As a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and as a Member of this House, I have voted millions of dollars for the protection of the Mississippi River, all of which was done under the guise of improving the navigation of the river and promoting commerce, and yet, in large degree, as we knew, it was really intended to control the flood waters of the Mississippi against riparian lands.

Mr. EMERSON. Why does the gentleman quibble over mere words? Why does he not suggest some way of changing the rule instead of criticizing it?

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen who have considered this probably have given it very serious consideration. I never heard of the resolution until yesterday afternoon, and I think the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors heard of it only yesterday after it had been considered and agreed to by the Committee on Rules. By way of parenthesis I might suggest that if the jurisdiction of a great committee of this House is to be diminished there should have been some consultation with the chairman of that committee. With the few minutes allotted to me I might suggest some amendment to this rule which would express in clear terms the jurisdiction of this new committee, but I would like to know in advance from the proponents of the rule what jurisdiction they wish to give it, and then I will try to formulate language which will express their thoughts. If the gentleman can say what he wishes the jurisdiction of this committee to be, I will try and express it for him. But a rule has been proposed, considered by the Committee on Rules, unanimously reported, and not a member of that committee can stand up and say what legislative jurisdiction is to be given to that new committee. Was it purposely of such brevity as to be made ambiguous, subject to conflicting construction? Were gentlemen who were proposing this rule really seeking to protect riparian lands from flood waters and secure action by Congress for drainage and afraid to put it in the rule either because of constitutional objection or for fear of creating prejudice or was it done ignorantly?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman think that the language in the rule as proposed is quite as explicit as it is in the rule now relating to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, which is "to the improvement of rivers and harbors"? Who knows what that means?

Mr. SMALL. The improvement of rivers and harbors, if the gentleman is asking me for an answer, means by universal consent improvement for the purpose of making them more easily navigable and promoting commerce.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman just stated that we have raised levees for the protection of adjoining property through the Rivers and Harbors Committee under that language.

Mr. SMALL. Well, nominally. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Then nobody knows what it means?

Mr. SMALL. Nominally it was for the improvement of the navigability of the river. Let us be frank and candid with one another. Every intelligent Member of this House has voted for millions of dollars for the Mississippi River, knowing what he was doing, knowing that a large part of that money was for the protection of those fertile lands along that great river against floods; and yet, because we realized that the problem was so stupendous that it was beyond the financial capacity of any State to protect its lands against that river, we have shut our eyes and have voted these millions of appropriations, and have done it gladly, under the guise of improving the navigability of the Mississippi. That is the truth, and every intelligent Member knows it is the truth.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. Inasmuch as the Committee on Rivers and Harbors have been doing that with their eyes shut, would it not be just as well to have a committee that might do it with their eyes open?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. But they do not have any power to appropriate anything.

Mr. SMALL. Then put it in your rule that that is the purpose of their jurisdiction. If the gentleman is a friend of this rule, let him propose an amendment to it defining its jurisdiction.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If that is the real purpose of the rule, would the gentleman object to the separation of the two lines of work?

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, if I understand the gentleman, I will make this answer: Take the great Mississippi River, if you please, and the Missouri and similar great rivers, interstate streams, the banks of which are subject to overflow, rivers which carry such immense volumes of water that in time of flood they are capable of and do inflict great damage to land and property and life.

I have always believed that by some means Congress ought to take jurisdiction of that matter in a way to solve the problem

as a great national problem ought to be solved. But the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the past has been criticized because it has reported large appropriations for such streams, and river and harbor improvements have been prejudiced before the country to some extent by reason of those criticisms. Personally, I have said, and I doubt not it has been the sentiment of other Members of the House, that it would be best that the question of protecting riparian lands, property, and life from the devastation of these rivers in flood time, while a national problem, ought to be divorced from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and if this rule were so expressed as to include such activity, so that Members could intelligently know that for which they were voting and could feel that no conflict of jurisdiction would arise, I would gladly vote for this rule and would think it a proper rule.

Mr. OGLESBY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. OGLESBY. If it were divorced from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, under what provision of the Constitution does the gentleman think that this work of flood prevention could be carried on and money appropriated therefor out of the Federal Treasury?

Mr. SMALL. I can not go into that question; and yet I may say just briefly, that for a great river like the Mississippi River I think authority could be found for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman from Florida yield me five minutes more?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I can only give the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield one minute to the gentleman.

Mr. SMALL. Then, Mr. Speaker, I have three minutes.

Now, unless necessary I would like to proceed without interruption, because there is just one more thought I want to give to the House. I said that this rule, in the language which it contains, would give rise to confusion and conflict of jurisdiction. Flood control, as I tried to explain, might and does mean protection against damage to contiguous land, and perhaps by any means which may be deemed advisable and proper, but flood control also involves the maintenance of channels in rivers. There are various important rivers in the United States, the improvement of which Congress has assumed the jurisdiction where flood waters are not overflowing the banks, but yet are constantly changing the location of the channel; sand bars are created and various diversions of the channel are brought about, and the maintenance of those channels involves the removal of those bars and other obstructions caused by flood waters, in order that an open channel may be maintained for navigation and commerce. And they are very important rivers, and there is your question of flood control. Will this new committee claim jurisdiction of flood control against damage to the channels of navigable rivers? If not, why not? If not, why not fix this rule so that such a construction can not be given to it, but under this language proposed this committee can have, and we know will claim, jurisdiction of flood control as it affects the channels of navigable rivers.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this rule was insufficiently considered. As I say, I do not know whether this language, brief as it is—and as I believe everyone will admit, because no Member has arisen to deny it—is ambiguous and will involve conflict of jurisdiction. I say that this rule as reported did not receive sufficient consideration, or else it was done inadvertently, or else it was done purposely in order to keep the real purpose of this rule within the constitutional jurisdiction of Congress, or in order to invade the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMALL. And gentlemen can take either horn of that dilemma. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have neither the desire nor the time to criticize the language of this rule, as some who oppose it have done. I understand that it was reported to the House by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Rules, and I believe that they understand the English language well enough to express the purpose of this rule. It reads for flood control. I do not believe there is a man in this House who does not know what a flood is, neither is there a man in this House who does not know what control means, and the purpose of this rule is to try to control the great floods that carry devastation through some part of the country almost every week of the year. You can hardly find a newspaper for any one

week that does not give an account of a flood somewhere in Ohio, Arizona, Georgia, Kentucky, Missouri, or somewhere else. I shall not speak of them, but I will speak for a moment about the grave importance of the floods that often devastate a portion of the district, that I have the honor to represent, upon the Mississippi River. I believe that you do not always stop to think of the serious aspect of these great floods. I want to call your attention to a brief sentence in a report made by Ernest Bicknell, the national director of the American Red Cross, after the great flood of 1912. I read this sentence:

In speaking of the number of people who were driven from their homes in that flood, while the number of persons requiring temporary help in the form of food and shelter was approximately 250,000, the number for whom further help in the form of seeds for planting, repairs to buildings, fences, furniture, clothing, farm implements, and so on, was necessary, may be estimated at approximately 50,000 people.

There is a flood in the Mississippi Valley to-day only 1 foot lower than it was at that time. It is rising every day now and promises to be a record-breaking flood in the Mississippi Valley. If that flood of 1912 drove from their homes 250,000 people, whom the Red Cross helped to relieve, I have no doubt that there is the same number of people in that country driven from their homes to-day. I do not know how many, but believe that there are hundreds of people to-day from my district in the hills of Kentucky, where they have fled to get out of the water and to save their lives. It is a dreadful condition. There is in Missouri, appointed by the governor, a waterways commission. That commission made a report of the results of the flood of 1912, and in that report they state that the damage to the five counties in my district affected by the flood of 1912 was \$13,255,000. More than \$13,000,000 in five counties in one flood. We have had several floods since and have one now. I speak of this to show you the great importance of flood control. I have great respect for the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors; I have great respect for every member on that committee. They have relieved us as best they could, but that committee was required by the rules that gave it power only to entertain and consider bills for the improvement of rivers. They have often said they could not consider bills that were exclusively for the control of floods unless they also affected the navigation of rivers. If it is true that you have got to have written in the rules, as my friend from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] seems to understand, everything that a committee of this House can do, then the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has never had any power whatever to consider bills for the relief of flood sufferers or for protection from floods, because that rule only gives that committee power to consider bills for the improvement of rivers and harbors. I hope this resolution will pass, so as to give us a committee with undoubted jurisdiction over flood control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how the time stands now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has 44 minutes and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] has 35 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARRETT. Has the time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] expired?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] has just spoken in reference to the necessity for some committee which has jurisdiction over the investigation of floods of this country. I wish to supplement that very briefly by calling the attention of this House to a condition that is now prevalent in the State of Indiana. There are more than 300 people in the little city of Martinsville to-day who have been driven from their homes. There are more than a thousand families along the Wabash River that have been driven from their homes. The Wabash River is denominated a navigable stream, but it is not navigated. So there is absolutely no chance for relief for the flood conditions along the Wabash River through the medium of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, because of the fact that they have not the jurisdiction to relieve the flood condition because it is not interfering with the navigability of that stream. And what may be said of the Wabash River may be likewise said of the White River, that is causing the devastation down at Martinsville. As to the flood spoken of by the gentleman from Missouri, we had a like one all along the Wabash River and throughout the State of Ohio. The city of Dayton was almost wiped out, many people lost their lives, and thousands of people not only had their homes destroyed but other property as well.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman say that this flood-control committee would have jurisdiction over the Miami River at Dayton, Ohio?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Of course they would have jurisdiction over the Miami River. There is not a river but finds its outlet to the sea, and of necessity finds its outlet in a navigable stream.

Mr. CURRY. The Miami River is all in one State, is it not?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Suppose it is?

Mr. CURRY. That is what we want to get at.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. My idea is that it is the purpose of government to subserve the interests of its people, and that it is the purpose of government to protect its people. It is the purpose of this preparation we are now talking much about to protect our people against the invasion of a foreign foe. We have the same jurisdiction, it seems to me, to protect our people from the invasion of the elements, from the invasion of high water. After the flood of 1913 the various States—Ohio, Indiana, and these other States—appointed scientific men for the purpose of studying the causes of these great floods. The floods are increasing constantly in number, and constantly in violence, by reason of the fact of the great drainage that is going on in the country constantly, taking the water that used to percolate through the ground and take months and months to get away, now drains suddenly into these streams. The rain that preceded the great floods of 1912 was an ordinary rain. It commenced on Saturday night and continued for about four days. It was not a hard rain anywhere. There have been harder rains throughout our country many times, and the same experience was had in the State of Ohio.

Mr. CURRY. It has been the understanding in Congress in the past that they have no authority to appropriate for flood control on waters within the confines of one State.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The same objection was raised the other day, in that we had no authority to appropriate money for the improvement of highways entirely within one State, and it was said that the only way that jurisdiction could be extended was by reason of the fact that it might possibly be used for a post road.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The town of Seabright, on the coast of New Jersey, was inundated last year, and a great deal of damage was done, with some loss of life. Does the gentleman think this new committee would have jurisdiction to afford relief in a case of that kind?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I think it would. There is not any question but that the United States has jurisdiction to improve harbors that are entirely within the jurisdiction of one State. Why? Because they have taken jurisdiction of those harbors.

Mr. CURRY. That is according to the Constitution. They have the control over navigable rivers and harbors.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It strikes me, gentlemen, that the quibble as to the constitutionality of this question is very far-fetched, for certainly the Government can find within its organic law a means by which it can protect these people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess].

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I live between the Little Miami and the Great Miami Rivers, in Ohio, within 17 miles of Dayton. Dayton was visited three years ago by one of the most destructive floods that city has known. Columbus is only a little distance from us, on the Scioto River, and it was visited by a like flood. It is not a question of whether we have a constitutional jurisdiction over those rivers, because they do empty into a navigable stream, the Ohio River. I shall vote for this rule, because it presupposes an increase of work due to an increase of floods. Floods are growing to be more disastrous every year, largely due to the deforestation of the country and also to the system of drainage, and, I might say, the encroachment of civilization upon our navigable streams. It seems to be that this is cumulative, and if it does take some work away from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors it would not hurt that committee. It will relieve the Rivers and Harbors Committee and give fuller opportunity to meet this growing necessity caused by the increase of injuries every year due to floods. Therefore I shall

freely vote for the measure, believing that I am justified in so doing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that the somewhat narrow policy it has pursued in the past in regard to our rivers and inland streams. I believe it will be necessary to view the river and its tributaries as a scientific whole. Of course, the great trunks are navigable streams.

I know that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has jurisdiction of the improvement of the navigable streams, or such portions of the navigable streams as they think commercial conditions require should be improved. But that is rather a narrow conception of the possibilities of improving the rivers. There are a great many streams of which the commercial possibilities would not justify improvement, and upon which there might be an increasing demand upon the Committee on Rivers and Harbors that they be improved under the color of commercial improvement. Unquestionably there are a great many tributaries of streams which are navigable and which cause the disturbance of navigation by flood conditions, but which are not themselves navigable from a commercial standpoint. So that the points of conflict, as I see them, between the jurisdiction of this proposed committee and the jurisdiction of the existing Committee on Rivers and Harbors are very few. So far as I can see, they are limited to the one single exception of the Mississippi River below Cairo.

So far as I know, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has not undertaken upon any broad scale works connected with both navigation and flood protection except upon the lower Mississippi. So far as I know, upon all the other propositions which the Committee on Rivers and Harbors handles, they limit it entirely to the question of navigation, and this leaves out two great elements of the control of the rivers. One is the reclamation of the adjoining land and the other is the control of floods, so far as damages to cities and crops are concerned. It is that particular portion which this new committee is designed to handle.

As to the constitutionality of any plan of flood control, I would not undertake at this time and in this brief moment to discuss it; but I do know that we have expended more than \$100,000,000 in trying to put water onto irrigable land, where there was no water and which land in many cases was in private ownership. This could not be justified purely as an improvement of our own Government land. If we have that power, we certainly have the same power to take water off land where there is too much water.

As to the commercial demand and necessity for it, there is no question. These floods are devastating and damaging to a great extent. Year after year the producers and toilers and commercial people of this country suffer heavy tribute in the damages caused by these floods, and a tribute of which the State or the community can not relieve them. Where water congests at a great junction point, like the mouth of the Kaw and the mouth of the Missouri, where is located Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans., the cause is not within local control. The waters causing the floods do not come from the States of Missouri and Kansas, but they come from the States of Iowa and Nebraska and Montana and the Dakotas. We have not control over the conditions that produce that flood. When the lower Mississippi is suffering from flood it is because the great torrents of the Missouri with all of its tributaries have poured in there. The Illinois and the Wisconsin and the Ohio have thrown their great tributary waters into the Mississippi. The people who chance to live in the Mississippi Valley, at St. Louis or at Cairo, for example, are not suffering from water collected in their community, over which they have control, but from water collected all over the Mississippi Valley higher up. That tribute every year is enormous, and it is a question for the American people whether they will make up their minds to stop the cause, and to effect the control of the floods by a broad scientific system of governmental activity, or whether the work should be limited to State, municipal, or local control, which has been wholly ineffectual in the past.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Rules, which reported this rule, and one who was present and voted to report it, I desire to say that nothing that I have heard in the debate has at all made me regret that vote.

I think that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] can be very readily answered in all of his arguments. He says that no one can define "flood control." Why, the gentleman is an able and a distinguished lawyer, and he knows that the best test of a phrase in a statute is to ascertain what has ordinarily, necessarily, or usually been done under that phrase. Now, in the River Danube and other rivers in Europe they have been working out the problems of flood control for over 500 years, and therefore what has ordinarily, necessarily, or usually been done under the head of flood control has a mass of precedents behind it, reaching back to a time prior to the discovery of the United States of America. If we had endeavored to put into the rule all of the things that have been done under the head of "flood control" which the gentleman from North Carolina says we should have done, we would have had a rule longer than the justly celebrated bill reported by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BAERNHART] in relation to printing, and we would not have gotten it up even for consideration in the House. There is nothing in that objection.

As to the time devoted to discussion, this question of flood control has been discussed in this House to my knowledge for 10 years, and certainly that is long enough for the ordinary Member of Congress to make up his mind.

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. BENNET. I will yield for a question.

Mr. OGLESBY. Under what particular provision of the Constitution have the men who have advocated this flood control during these long years thought they could get money out of the Federal Treasury?

Mr. BENNET. Without taking too much of my precious time, for I have only five minutes, I will say to the gentleman that if he will read the somewhat celebrated reply of Mr. Webster to Mr. Hayne he will find that subject far more adequately discussed than I can discuss it in my brief time. I must decline to yield further, because I have not the time.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to ask the gentleman an easy question.

Mr. BENNET. If I yielded to the gentleman, I would have to yield to others, and so, without meaning any discourtesy, I must decline to yield.

I voted for this rule in the committee because it seemed to me that it was right; and not only is it right, but it affords me one opportunity at least, representing the largest Democratic congressional district in the State of New York, and, so far as I have found out, the largest Democratic congressional district in the United States, to vote according to the Baltimore platform of the Democratic Party on one subject.

I have been informed by those who were here in the Sixty-third Congress that it was not at all times possible apparently for gentlemen on the other side of the aisle to vote in accordance with the provisions of the Democratic platform. I know it will please the 27,757 enrolled Democrats in my district to know that I am able to vote in accordance with that provision of the Democratic platform which says:

We hold that the control of the Mississippi River is a national problem. The preservation of the depth of its water for the purpose of navigation, the building of levees to maintain the integrity of its channel, and the prevention of the overflow of the land and its consequent devastation, resulting in the interruption of interstate commerce, the disorganization of the mail service, and the enormous loss of life and property, impose an obligation which alone can be discharged by the General Government.

And I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], in answer to his question, and to my colleague from New York [Mr. OGLESBY] that they both probably can find an answer to their several questions in the platform, which no doubt they heartily advocated on the stump both in 1912 and 1914. [Applause.]

Equally strong declarations the same way are in the platforms of the respective parties of the 13,968 Republicans and of the 2,345 Progressives. In voting to create this committee I am voting to carry out the platform pledges of the parties whose aggregate enrollment comprises about 90 per cent of the voting strength of the district. As I am old-fashioned enough to believe in carrying out party platform promises, this opportunity to do so gives me particular pleasure.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I would not take the time to address the House on this matter were it not for the fact that we have a flood situation in Delaware which is of a peculiar sort. A few minutes ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] asked about Sea Bright, N. J., which was devastated by a flood tide from the ocean accompanied by a northeast storm. We had a similar case at Rehoboth, in Delaware, where the entire ocean front for 5 miles or more was washed out last year, together with several blocks of city property and the houses thereon. We also have a flood situation in connection with the Rehoboth and Indian River Bays, in Delaware, and should the House create this committee on flood control, and the Federal Government be given additional authority through the creation of this new committee, I believe the situations mentioned above worthy of notice and consideration. I feel, therefore, that I should say a few words in the general debate on this resolution which I favor and intend to vote for.

In my opinion the question of flood control should be taken in charge by the National Government, and the circumstances that have been related here to-day by the Arkansas delegation in particular should impress those who are not familiar with the subject, and who are not touched by that particular matter. I realize that there will be differences of opinion between the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and this proposed committee on the matter of jurisdiction over certain bills, but in my opinion we should look beyond the mere interference of jurisdiction in the House here between committees, and consider this question as it relates to the country in its national importance.

As was shown in my few remarks on the road bill, I do not favor the Government going into expenditures such as that bill might have called forth. But flood regulation is a question that concerns people all over the country who live on navigable rivers and other streams. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, it concerns them vitally, for when people need relief from floods and the attendant circumstances it is generally in an emergency, and the relief must be immediately provided. All of us have the greatest sympathy for the people living in the great Mississippi Valley, whose lands are inundated and whose property is destroyed by floods many times in a single decade. The National Government is the only governmental agency that is capable of dealing with the flood situation, and it certainly is patent to all that the time has come for the creation of a committee in this House whose duty it will be to deal with this great problem.

I for one would be willing to enlarge the scope of this committee, for the rule as amended by this resolution does not give the proposed committee the power to make appropriations. At this point I beg to state that I trust no embarrassment will come to the members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors by the creation of this new committee. I have listened to the arguments of the several distinguished members of that committee against this proposition, but I believe that the question of flood control is a question well unto itself and one which well warrants the creation of a committee of this House to consider matters relating thereto.

In the first part of my remarks I referred to the disastrous experience which befell Rehoboth Beach in my State. This is a large and populous summer resort located along the shores of the Atlantic Ocean. In the fall of 1914 a terrific flood tide, whipped into fury by a northeast storm of several days' duration, completely wrecked a large part of this town located along the ocean front, besides destroying the board walk and bulkheads, while a number of blocks of houses fronting along the ocean were swept bodily into the sea and their contents spread broadcast over the waters. The experience of this community in my State was only a repetition of what happened at Sea Bright, N. J., to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has referred, as well as other places along the coast. The citizens of this community in my State bravely set about repairing the damage wrought by this crushing blow, paying for the same out of their pockets. When the general assembly met in the following January, they were appealed to for State aid to erect a system of bulkheads which would protect the coast in the future. It was my great good fortune to be able to assist in the passage of this bill through the general assembly, as I was then serving as secretary of state and was in daily contact with the general assembly. I am glad that I am able to take part in a small way in advocating and assisting in the passage of this resolution, which is national in its scope, and if the committee on flood control can solve this problem which confronts a great portion of our country to-day its existence will be amply justified.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to oppose the adoption of this rule, very largely out of the great respect I hold for its proposer. Looking at the brief document submitted to us, I find that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], our honored and respected Speaker, is the author of the resolution. Out of regard for him personally I wish it were in my power to vote for the resolution. However, it does not seem to me that this is an opportune time for the introduction of such a resolution. I wish he had proposed it at the beginning of the session of Congress, when the various committees of this House were being made up. So far as I know it was not brought to the attention of the Members of the House until day before yesterday. The Committee on Rules evidently gave it very marked consideration and deep study, because one of the members takes particular pains to inform us that he was present when the rule was considered. Out of regard for the remaining members of the committee, I do not think we had better ask for a call of the roll of the attendance of the Committee on Rules when the matter was under consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I should like to know if there was some member present at the meeting of the committee who favored this rule? I wanted to ask that question a moment ago, but got no opportunity.

Mr. MANN. Both gentlemen know that it would not be a legitimate question to be asked here in the House.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It would be legitimate to know who appeared—

Mr. MANN. Not under the rules of the House, and it would not be permissible for a member of either committee to state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Suppose the hearings had been published. Would it be permissible for us to read them?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, is this coming out of my time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair supposes so. The gentleman yielded.

Mr. TREADWAY. I did not yield for a general discussion of parliamentary procedure in the committee room.

I am very glad that the member of the Committee on Rules from New York [Mr. BENNET], who has recently spoken, is able in one respect to satisfy his 27,000 Democratic constituents. He said he was voting to sustain one plank in the Democratic platform by supporting this rule, as the platform adopted at Baltimore expressly states the party is in favor of flood control. Happy man! He can satisfy his Republican as well as his Democratic constituents. Why did he not speak of the large number of Republicans who, of course, voted for him? The Republican platform has a strong plank on the very same question to which he referred, namely, flood control of the Mississippi River. I quote the Republican plank on the subject:

The Mississippi River is the Nation's drainage ditch. Its flood waters, gathered from 31 States and the Dominion of Canada, constitute an overpowering force which breaks the levees and pours its torrents over many million acres of the richest land in the Union, stopping mails, impeding commerce, and causing great loss of life and property. These floods are national in scope, and the disasters they produce seriously affect the general welfare. The States unaided cannot cope with this giant problem. Hence we believe the Federal Government should assume a fair proportion of the burden of its control so as to prevent the disasters from recurring floods.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this question is brought up at this time owing to the horrible conditions that we know to exist in some Western States. My colleague on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas, has shown you the conditions existing in his district, with which we all have the greatest sympathy. But, so far as I know, no request has been presented to this House looking for relief of that condition. If they need instant relief, why have they not introduced some resolution for that purpose? There is no man on this floor but will stand ready and willing to vote such assistance as may be desired, and no red tape of committee action will stand in the way of relieving the distress and suffering of our fellow countrymen.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the whole subject of that condition as it may exist there, now temporary in its nature, is being used as a means of appealing to this House to adopt a permanent rule, incorporating it in our rules, simply using present conditions as a psychological opportunity to appeal to the sympathies of the Members of the House. The member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois, who eloquently debated the subject, seemed to consider that the establishment of a committee, calling it the committee on flood control, would of itself prevent

nature from allowing water to run down hill. It will not do it. [Laughter and applause.]

Further, I feel that there will arise conflict of authority and jurisdiction between this new committee, if created, and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I have no feeling in the matter whatever, but I do think it fair to call attention to the fact that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has been very generous in its allotment of appropriations to the Mississippi River, the very cause for which it is evidently the intent of the proposers to establish a new committee.

Under the cloak of navigation we have made appropriations of millions of dollars and placed the amounts in the hands of the Mississippi River Commission, to expend in such manner as it might deem wise. It is, of course, true that the primary object of this commission is the construction of levees, revetment of banks, and similar work, all for the purpose of flood control and reclamation. Therefore, so far as fair treatment to the Mississippi River is concerned, the establishment of this new committee is entirely unnecessary.

I feel I must add one word of criticism to the method employed in securing such quick action on this proposed amendment to the rules. The resolution was introduced by Speaker CLARK on February 1; the Committee on Rules states that it considered it on February 2, and on February 3 action upon it comes up with only those Members having knowledge that it was to be considered to-day who were directly interested in its passage. It is not for me to criticize methods used at this time, but certainly a certain amount of courtesy is due fellow Members.

Knowing, as I do, the ability of the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee [Mr. SPEAKMAN], and appreciating the hard work he does in his capacity as chairman of that committee, I feel constrained to express regret that the advocates of the establishment of this new committee did not see fit to take him into their confidence. Mr. Speaker, irrespective of the merits of the proposition before us, certainly this courtesy should have been extended to that most courteous of all gentlemen, the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, if I were to argue in favor of this rule on the same basis as some members of the committee have I would be opposed to it, because I have no personal interest in it, as I represent a congressional district that is probably as nearly immune from serious floods as any district in the United States. However, long before I became a Member of this House I read—and have remembered it ever since, and hope I may remember it as long as I am a Member of the House—a statement by Mr. Justice Cooley, who said that when a man went to Congress and held up his hand and took the oath of office it became his patriotic duty to say, "Not what is best for my district only, but what is best for my country."

I see all over the country a growing danger and terror of floods. I apprehend that it is largely due to the fact that in building bridges, and so forth, we are encroaching too much on the channels of the streams, and that in building bridges we do not build them high enough. I am not one who believes that the committee created by this rule could have any means of controlling the elements, although I have seen stranger things happen on the floor of this House than an undertaking of that kind. But from what I have seen of the devastation of floods and the damages, and all that follows the ravages of such calamities, I am certainly in favor of this proposition, because, if it does no more, it will show to the people of the country who are sufferers from these floods that we, their Representatives, are interested in preventing distress wherever it is possible for Congress to do so.

Such a committee can find out and report on the possibility of flood prevention and protection; and surely such frequent misfortunes demand our prompt, earnest, and most intelligent action. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the Committee on Rules yesterday when it reported out this resolution. Had I been present, I should not have voted for it in its present form. I expect the rule will be adopted, but I am clear that it ought not to be adopted in the form in which it is presented. It is entirely clear to me, as I think it must be to the membership of this House after this debate, that in its present form it will give rise to great confusion between the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and this committee on flood control.

What is meant by flood control? If they speak of unusual floods that destroy levees and property I can not conceive of

a situation where navigation is not involved in that kind of flood. Do you seek to prevent floods by building reservoirs at the heads of the great rivers? That squarely involves the question of navigation. Do you want to prevent floods by revetments and levees on the Mississippi River? That, too, inevitably involves a question of navigation. Where will the Speaker draw the line in referring bills, with this new committee created? What will happen is that a bill will be presented having directly to do with navigation but declared upon its face to prevent floods. It will go to the committee on flood control, while the navigation proposition involved will be quite as important, perhaps, as that of flood control.

If we have a new committee at all on this subject, it seems entirely clear that the jurisdiction of each of these committees should be specifically defined. If I might have had the framing of this rule, it clearly would have provided that no bills relating to navigation should go to this committee. If that had been done, there would have been no objection to it. But, possibly, Mr. Speaker, the principal object of this new committee is to consider bills not for the prevention of the kind of floods I have spoken of but those kinds of floods, not unusual in their character, but which recur year after year, overflowing bottom land on some rivers; and the design of this may be to seek appropriations not for the saving of life and property but to reclaim lands, valueless to-day, and do it at the public expense without the lands contributing one dollar to the cost of their reclamation. I, of course, do not believe the author of the rule had this in mind. So while I expect the rule to be adopted, I do say it ought not to be adopted in its present form, and I prophesy now that it will give trouble in the future on the matter of jurisdiction if it be adopted. If this rule was defeated to-day, there would be no difficulty in the Committee on Rules again taking it up and framing a new rule and presenting it to this House defining the jurisdiction of these respective committees. [Applause.]

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. CURRY. Does the gentleman think the adoption of this rule would transfer jurisdiction of the Rivers and Harbors Committee over the flood control of navigable streams, the waters of which rise and flow through one State only?

Mr. LENROOT. I think it would.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. HULBERT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks this situation could be more effectively dealt with if the duties of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors were divided so that we would have a Committee on Rivers and a Committee on Harbors?

Mr. LENROOT. That might be a very good suggestion.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not undertake, in five minutes, to discuss the technical phraseology of this resolution. I am in favor of the resolution and expect to support it not simply because of any emergency that may exist at the present time but because of the possibility that exists all of the time of an emergency being created in the matter of floods. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] a moment ago suggested that no bill or resolution had been introduced here for the relief of flood sufferers in the localities where the conditions exist. The gentleman is mistaken about that. I am sure a number of resolutions and bills have been introduced. I know that two have been introduced by myself. I know the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR] has a resolution, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] has introduced resolutions. Every man whose people are affected by the floods that are now in progress, and that come every year, have introduced resolutions seeking to relieve the people who are involved in the floods. But it is a difficult proposition to get a bill through this House, or the Congress, for the relief of any particular locality; and there is only one form of efficient relief that can come in the long run, and that is relief that takes care of the whole situation and prepares the Government to take care of the situations whether they be local or general in their nature.

In addition to what the gentleman from New York said a while ago about the platform of the Democratic Party upon this subject, I desire to call attention to the platform of the Republican Party. In 1912 both political parties now represented on this floor took the position that the Mississippi River, being a stream that drains 31 States of the Union and 41 per cent of the territory of the United States, is of sufficient national importance to justify Congress taking it up as a separate proposition. I have no criticism to make of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I think they have performed

their duties as far as they could with efficiency and patriotism and with a desire to render the greatest benefit to the people of the United States; but here is a great stream that is not a local stream, the most treacherous stream that flows anywhere in the world, and now from the mouth of the Ohio River down to the Gulf of Mexico the water of 31 States of the Union is flowing through it, and by reason of the fact that heretofore the Government has constructed levees along the Mississippi River and thereby invited men to build up their homes and cultivate the soil adjacent thereto and which is now in danger, I think there is such a national problem as ought to be dealt with by Congress.

In the city of Hickman, in my district, a city of more than 6,000 people, every able-bodied man is at this moment at work seeking to protect the levee that has been constructed by the Government from destruction by the Mississippi River, and the consequent inundation of hundreds of thousands of acres of land and the homes of the people in that city. They do it not only in the daytime but in the nighttime. They do it every year; and as Judge RUSSELL suggested a moment ago, there are thousands of people from his district and from Arkansas and Missouri who have gone across the Mississippi River and are now seeking refuge in the hills of Kentucky. Is not that a national problem—to undertake to care for those people, to undertake to preserve their property and lives—and is it fair to expect the local communities, which are doing everything they can and which have exhausted their powers of taxation and their resources from a charitable standpoint and from every standpoint, to take care of the situation created by the water of 31 States which flows by their doors and inundates their homes? We speak a great deal about preparation for national defense. Mr. Speaker, there are other enemies of the country than foreign enemies, and the Mississippi River is one of the most fearful enemies to the people who live in its valley, and I think we should protect them as far as is possible from its recurring ravages. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON].

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I can not hope, in the limited time allowed me under the rules, to say what I desire to say upon this question. Sometime during this session I am going to ask the privilege of addressing the House at more length upon the importance of the question of flood control to the people of my State and district. I do not believe there is a question that will come before this Congress that is of more vital interest to the people I represent than that of flood control. If you gentlemen when you go back to your offices will get a map of the United States and look right at the center of the country, at that point situated in the lap of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers where they come together at the extreme southern part of Illinois, you will see the district that I have the honor to represent. It consists of the eight lower counties of the State, five of which border upon the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. I can not state exactly what part of the district is lowland and what part is highland, but I will say that perhaps a fourth of my district, if not a third, is what might be called lowlands, and a great part of this would be subject to overflow from the floods and back waters of these two great rivers were it not for the protection which they receive from the levees that have been constructed.

Mr. Speaker, that part of Illinois has been under cultivation since the early part of the century; and I want to say that there can not be found anywhere in the United States more beautiful, more productive, or better improved farms than those along the bottoms of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers in the southern part of Illinois; and there can not be found anywhere a class of farmers that are more thrifty, industrious, persevering, and patriotic than those who have reclaimed those fertile fields from the floods of the father of waters, protected them as best they could by the construction of levees, and converted them into beautiful and prosperous farms. Mr. Speaker, these farmers of my district have liberally expended hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars in the construction of levees along the two rivers, and the money they have saved and invested in their homes and other improvements are dependent for protection upon the frail levees which they have built with their own means. But year after year the great flood of waters that comes sweeping down the Mississippi River from the north and the Ohio River from the east is a source of constant terror to the people of these valleys, not infrequently washing away the banks of the rivers, altering or dividing the thread of the streams, and eating into and destroying the levees which the people have built. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in my judgment a great deal of the money which the farmers of that region have expended in the construction of levees for the pro-

tection of their farms will, before long, have been wasted unless the National Government takes hold of this flood question and assists in protecting from the ravages of these waters the levees that have already been built, and helps to build them higher and stronger.

Now, this question of controlling the flood waters of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers is not a local question. It is one of the Nation's problems. It has long been recognized to be such, but has never been properly handled. I believe that the time has come when the Federal Government should take hold of this, one of its greatest problems, and solve it. The control of the flood waters of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and their tributaries should be made a separate national project, like the building of the Panama Canal or the Alaskan Railroad. A plan should be worked out by which a coordinated system of levees and other river improvements would be constructed under scientific and continuous methods, and I do not doubt that the floods of these great rivers can ultimately be controlled, millions of acres of rich land reclaimed, and millions of dollars saved to the people each year.

Mr. Speaker, if the Members of Congress could happen to be in the Mississippi Valley during the winter and spring floods, when the melting snows from the mountains of the West and the rains from the plains of the North and Northwest come roaring down the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers to join those from the Ohio, Tennessee, and other rivers from the East, and see the terrible destruction of property and even the loss of life that the people of those valleys suffer, I do not believe that there is one of you who would not know that the question of controlling these annual floods is one for the whole Nation to solve and that it ought to begin doing so right now. Even while we are discussing this question, I am advised that the flood has reached 53 feet at Cairo and that the people all up and down the valley are being driven from their homes, while stock and grain and other property are being washed away.

No one who has not lived there or been there during these trying times can fully appreciate the awful terrors and the suffering and privation to which those people are exposed when these unusual floods occur. Yesterday I received a telegram from the president of the Chamber of Commerce of Cairo appealing to me to ask the War Department to send the Government boats from places where they were stationed on the river to aid in rescuing the people and the stock from their perilous positions in the flooded districts. I called upon the Acting Secretary of War, and I want to say that he responded promptly and assured me that instructions would be sent forward to give aid wherever possible. I found that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and other Members from Kentucky, Missouri, and Arkansas were urgently appealing to the War Department for its assistance in this great calamity. Mr. Speaker, the people of the city of Cairo are not asking any aid for themselves. They are doing so for others who are not so well protected from the floods as they. Cairo has heretofore appealed to Congress for aid, and aid was generously given when asked; and I want to say here that every citizen of that thriving busy little city is profoundly grateful for the assistance Congress has given them, which, with the aid received from the State of Illinois, has enabled them to raise and strengthen the levees which protect the city. This has been a heavy burden upon the people of Cairo, but they have met it bravely and cheerfully.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there can be found anywhere a braver, more courageous, persevering, hopeful, and resourceful people than those of Cairo and other cities and towns in that valley, who year after year have spent their money, patrolled their levees, and day after day and night and day fought back the waters which almost half the Nation sends down upon them in a mad rush to the sea. I hope that whenever the Members of this House chance to pass that way they will take the time to stop off in Cairo and see what a wonderfully thriving, prosperous, and attractive little city has been builded at the confluence of those two great rivers by the virtues and the capital of its citizens, with the aid of the State and Nation. And, Mr. Speaker, a visit to Cairo, with its prosperous mills, factories, railroads, and river commerce, and its 25,000 busy and contented people, working by day and by night with faith in the protection of their wonderful levees, the gem and future metropolis of the Mississippi Valley, would, I think, be the strongest argument that could be offered for national aid in the construction of levees wherever they are needed for protection from the floods of these great rivers.

I think the time has come for the Government to declare its policy toward the Mississippi River. We can not hope for help from the Rivers and Harbors Committee, whose jurisdiction extends only to questions of navigation and commerce. I had

occasion, Mr. Speaker, to take a trip down the Mississippi River this last fall from Grand Tower to Cairo, in company with some of my constituents who have studied this river question all their lives and are deeply interested. We were on a Government boat and accompanied by the Army officer in charge, and a representative of the Mississippi River Commission. I pointed out different places along the River where a little work by the Government would save a great deal of protection work that had been done in former years and now only needed repairing. I called attention to places here and there, where the Government, by a small expenditure, could prevent a cutting of the bank, or diversion of the channel, or save the levees of some of the drainage districts from ruin, and protect thousands of acres of fertile farms from overflow. To all of these suggestions we were met with the same old reply that under the present policy of the Government the department could only consider questions of navigation; that it would aid navigation for the river to remain crooked and the waters be held back, even though they did overflow and destroy the farms of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I think this whole question should be taken out of the hands of the Rivers and Harbors Committee; it should be divorced from the question of navigation. A separate committee should be provided to handle all questions of flood control. And if it should be found that the problem of flood control and the problem of navigation or commerce conflict, then it would be for Congress in its wisdom to harmonize them in the interest of the greatest number of the people. I hope the House will adopt this resolution and appoint this new committee, and that the committee when appointed will enter upon an investigation of this great national question and report out a bill at this session that will at least offer the people of the Mississippi Valley some hope for the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has 23 minutes and the gentleman from Kansas 15.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GOODWIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, in the very limited time allowed me I shall not attempt to go into elaborate detail and explain to the House the awful condition in which some part of my district is placed, one county in part bordering on the Mississippi on the east and two counties bordering upon the Red River upon the west, because in a measure that has been detailed to you by my colleagues, Messrs. TAYLOR and CARAWAY; and the same condition that affects their district likewise affects mine. I think the passage of this resolution, and the creating of the committee on the control of floods will be a long step in the right direction. As time goes on we become more and more progressive, and we yield to the needs of people who are stricken. In the evolution of government we can not be guided by the past nor by precedent alone, we must make a step forward. Some gentlemen have said that inasmuch as they live remote from the overflow districts or from inundations, up in the mountainous sections of this great country, their people should not bear part of the burden of those who live upon the lowlands.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that no considerable number of the membership of this House have such a narrow and restricted view and vision. Who is thy neighbor? I can not answer that, nor can you, half so well as that great Teacher of men who while on earth answered the question for all time to come. Upon one occasion He was asked by a lawyer who sought to confuse and mystify Him by saying, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" And the Savior said, "Hast thou read the law, and art thou familiar with the scriptures?" He said, "Yes; I have read them." "What do they say?" "Why, the law says, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy mind, with all thy strength, and with all thy soul, and thy neighbor as thyself.'" The great Teacher said, "Thou hast answered correctly." But, Mr. Speaker, not content and still determined to mystify his Maker, he said, "Master, who is my neighbor?" Now, the Master never answered any question directly; His answers to all questions were not local, but were intended for all time, for generations then not born. He said, "Upon one occasion a man came down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and he fell among thieves, who stripped him of his raiment and inflicted wounds upon his body; and, leaving him half dead, they went away. Presently

a priest came along, and, deaf to the importunities of the suffering man, he passed on the other side. Later on a Levite came by, and he, too, turned a deaf ear to his importunities. Then a Samaritan came along. He did not turn from him, but he went in his direction and gave relief and succor to the stricken man. He put on his raiment, bound up his wounds with oil and ointment and wine. He set him upon his beast and took him to a near-by inn and stayed there over the night; and on the morrow as he left he placed 2 shillings in the hand of the host and said, 'Take this for thy trouble, and upon my return I will pay you the residue,' and he went his way. 'Who,' said the Saviour, 'was this man's neighbor?' 'Manifestly,' the lawyer said, 'the man who gave succor and relief to the stricken one.' 'Then,' said the Lord, 'go thou and do likewise.'

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that the American Congress has always been responsive, duly responsive, to the great catastrophes that have come over this country. Need I recall that about two years ago we made an appropriation to the stricken people of Salem, Mass., where millions of dollars of property had been destroyed and thousands of poor people lost all of their worldly possessions and were driven out into the cold without money and without labor? [Applause.]

Why, Mr. Speaker, I have been criticized by those who now oppose me for voting for this bill, but I am glad that in my charity my heart goes out to stricken humanity wherever it may be found, and that my vision and my sympathies are not confined to the pigsty in my back lot, or even to my own front gate, but that in my generosity of soul and heart I would have this Government to extend a helping hand, as far as it is able so to do, where great bodies of people are sorely stricken by sudden catastrophes, where the local communities or the States are unable to give succor and relief.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, how many people it would take to pay only one dollar of that appropriation that was voted for the poor, unfortunate, homeless people of Salem, Mass., on account of that fire? I have just made the figures. We have 100,000,000 American citizens, and here was an appropriation for these stricken, unfortunate people, and it would take 500 people, all being taxed equally to contribute only \$1 of this amount. There are many communities in my own district, sir, which have a population of about 500, and if all of these 500 people contributed the same amount the whole 500 paid but \$1 of this appropriation. Sir, the Congress of the United States has upon many occasions voted money out of the Treasury for the relief of great communities which suffered from floods and fires and volcanic eruptions, not only in the United States but to many parts of the world beyond the American Continent. Sir, my own district, the county of Chicot and the eastern part of Ashley County, in 1911 and 1912, when I first came to Congress, received many thousands of dollars in supplies, food, and the like, furnished by the United States through an earnest effort put forth by me, when all of Chicot County and a part of the eastern part of Ashley County suffered from overflows and floods; and the people of the North and the East and the West came to our rescue down there with a generous and an appreciative impulse.

Sixteen years ago the city of Galveston, Tex., was visited by a great flood which almost destroyed that great city, and you, sir, Mr. Speaker, and many other gentlemen now upon this floor were Members of Congress at that time; and you gentlemen of the North and from the West and from the East responded liberally to the stricken people of that southern city. Ten years ago next April the great city of San Francisco was visited by an earthquake, and I do not have to repeat the awful condition visited upon many of the citizens of that metropolis nor the aid and appropriation made by Congress then in their behalf. Nor need I speak of the generosity of Congress upon several occasions when fire and flood and volcanic eruptions have visited other parts of the world, notably in Martinique, Italy, in Sicily, and other places. The generous hand of this Government was responsive to the suffering thousands where their own Governments were unable to properly care for their own suffering humanity.

I only speak of this, Mr. Speaker, in reply to those upon this floor who take a narrow and less generous view of the duty of the Federal Government now in their opposition to the creation of this committee on the control of floods, for the reason, they say, the Federal Government has no authority and no right to give aid and protection to build levees; likewise as an aid and protection for the prevention of floods, when back of those levees live many millions of people who by the labor of their hands help to feed and clothe the world, and who likewise defend our country's flag in times of war and make her glorious in times of peace.

Sir, we must keep step with the demands of the times and with the growth of civilization. Unfortunately for the people of this country as well as for the people of all countries, legislation has been confined largely to the protection of property rights to the exclusion of human rights. One of the great questions to-day confronting the American Republic and to which the Congress of the United States must give increasing attention is the question of conservation—not to conserve one or two or three material aspects of the question, but conservation in its broadest and most liberal sense—to come to the assistance of the States and communities in the conservation of our soil, to prevent its erosion, and the conservation of our Government-owned forests in a system finally of reforestation; to the conservation of our mines by seeing that these are not monopolized by the greed and avarice of a few men who, unfortunately, already have seized too much of this part of the public domain, appropriating the same to their own use and behoof; to the conservation of the waters of the country, not only to prevent overflows and inundations, but likewise, Mr. Speaker, to house and reservoir these waters, that the same may be let loose from time to time not only as an aid to navigation, but to the irrigation of the dry and arid lands of many parts of our country, notably in the western and southwestern portions of the United States; and last, but not least, sir, to the conservation not only of these property rights, a few of which I have named, but, higher and above all these, to the conservation of the rights and liberties and the possibilities of the people in human endeavor, in the lengthening of their lives, and in the restoration of the health and the giving of renewed strength and vigor to the physical activities of the people.

I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that this view is a little more liberal and possibly a little more broad than some of my friends here in the House will agree to; but what, sir, is the function of government, for what purpose were governments created and instituted, if not for the protection of the people, to give hope and courage to their aspirations and to their ambitions. And I hope the time will never come, sir, when, as a Member of this House, in keeping with the Constitution, which all of us have taken an oath to support, that I shall fail and refuse to lift my voice and to give my vote to those things of which I have spoken, conserving not only property rights, but granting to the people what the legislation of most countries has denied—still greater rights, the rights of humanity itself.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE].

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to support this resolution because my district has suffered from floods more than any other district in Indiana. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OGLESBY].

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. OGLESBY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I make a like request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GOODWIN] makes a like request. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen may have leave to print on this rule for five legislative days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks that all gentlemen may have leave to extend their remarks in the Record on this subject for five legislative days. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER].

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am for this resolution. It seems to me that it is one of so great importance as any that could be introduced into the House. What scheme may be worked out in reference to flood control, of course, is only to be determined in the future by the action of this committee and finally by Congress. But it is such a large problem, especially in the Mississippi Valley, that the States, the municipalities, and the people generally, can not take care of it with the great amount of water that goes down the Mississippi River

from the tributaries that flow into that river. It is a matter of national importance.

The Federal Government has spent up to and including June 30, 1915, \$32,320,178 on the levees of the Mississippi River from Cape Girardeau to its mouth. The people living along this river have incurred a debt and spent \$91,105,990. In many of the localities they have taxed themselves every way possible to secure money to build these levees. Navigation can not be maintained on the Mississippi River without some plan to prevent the constant washing of its banks.

The burden of the building of these levees and attempting to prevent floods is so heavy that these people can not alone carry on this work. All parties in their platforms have declared in favor of flood control, or, at least, for the Federal Government having control of the problem of floods in the Mississippi. The value of reclamation of lands which are now overflowed would amount, if that work were done, to hundreds of millions of dollars throughout the United States. We have inaugurated the system of reclamation of lands in the West which has been of great benefit in that part of the country, but I submit that throughout all of the United States, and especially is this so in the great Mississippi Valley, that millions of acres of the very best land can be reclaimed if some feasible way is found whereby that work can be done. I do not know, and no Member of this House knows, what the future may develop in reference to flood control; but aside from the loss of property that occurs whenever these great floods come in the rivers there is a problem of the control of floods so that these lands may become farming lands—so they will become productive each year.

In the State of Illinois the Wabash and other streams overflow thousands of acres of the most productive lands in the world, and a feasible plan has not been found whereby these floods may be prevented and in that way these lands made profitable. The system of drainage which has been inaugurated in many places along these streams puts so much water in them and so quickly it is impossible as conditions now exist to prevent these serious overflows, and as a result millions of dollars of damage to the owner of the land occurs each year. No man in this House knows now what means may be worked out for preventing these serious floods, but it is to be hoped that a committee may study this problem and arrive at some solution of what can be done. Congress would hardly be expected to appropriate money for the drainage of private land, but it can at least afford information in some way whereby it can be done and, if necessary, assist the people as is now being done in the Reclamation Service. It is a problem that must be solved in the future, and we hope this will be a start in the right direction.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reforms come and go, and another reform has gone glimmering. When our Democratic friends obtained control of the House in the Sixty-second Congress the first thing they did in the interest of economy in the public service was to abolish the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River. That committee had been in existence for years under Republican control of the House. Now, after a few years have passed since this reform was inaugurated it is proposed to establish this same committee under a different name. And I congratulate the gentlemen on the other side of the House in now admitting that a few years ago they were mistaken when they attempted to leave no committee with jurisdiction over the flood and levee problems of the Mississippi River.

Mr. Speaker, I have served in this House under four distinguished Speakers—the great parliamentarian and Speaker, Thomas B. Reed; the gallant soldier and great Speaker, David B. Henderson, of Iowa; and the Speaker who, in my opinion, will always be ranked among the great Speakers and the great men of this country, the man with the iron nerve, my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. [Applause.] And I serve with pleasure under the present distinguished Speaker.

Gentlemen have said here to-day that this was a new proposition. Session after session, or term after term, the present distinguished Speaker of the House has introduced into the House bills, full in character, relating to the question of drainage and control of flood waters. I do not recall whether those bills have been referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors or not; but if so, they have been contributions to the waste basket. Whenever they have gone, no committee has had real jurisdiction to do anything with them. I am not in favor of the Government spending vast sums of money in the drainage of lands, either public or private, but we have reached the time in the consideration of our country when these problems must at least be investigated, and perhaps we shall be compelled to contribute something to their help, both on and off the Mississippi River.

The present distinguished Speaker of the House, whom we all admire and love [applause], seldom has made a request to this House involving his personal opinions or his personal desires. But the resolution reported to-day by the Committee on Rules reads:

Mr. CLARK of Missouri submitted the following resolution.

It is a resolution of the Speaker of the House. After long study of this subject of drainage and flood control, the Speaker of the House asks us to favorably consider a proposition to authorize a committee of the House to have jurisdiction over these subjects. I am quite willing, irrespective of the other merits of the proposition, to accede to this request of the Speaker, who so seldom makes personal requests of the House. [Applause.] And I hope that the resolution will be treated both as its merits and its source deserve, and that it may receive the unanimous vote of both sides of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the State of Louisiana is vitally interested in this problem, and the prosperity and welfare of her people are, in my opinion, largely dependent upon the passage of this resolution, the purpose of which is to create a committee the functions of which shall be to deal with the problems arising out of recurrent floods upon the Mississippi and other rivers in the United States. We have heard here this afternoon the statements of the gentlemen from Ohio, from Illinois, from Missouri, from Tennessee, and from Arkansas concerning the great volume of water coming down from the various streams in those States.

Mr. Speaker, all this flood of water, with all of its destructive force coming from all those States, and from 32 States of this Union, must eventually pass through the State of Louisiana, and this entire volume of water must, in its course, pass through the fifth congressional district of Louisiana, the great district which I have the honor to represent on this floor; and as this flood now proceeds from the rivers of those States, rushing into the mighty Mississippi, with Louisiana as its ultimate destination, there are at this hour, in order to protect our lands and the property and lives of our people on the line of levees from the imperial city of New Orleans to the Arkansas line, thousands of men who work by day and by night to avoid, if possible, the awful consequences of this oncoming flood. Mr. Speaker, this constitutes with us a flood problem, and we feel that if given a committee of this House, that could concentrate its collective thought and combined energies upon the problem of flood protection, this problem could be worked out and a final solution reached. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the State of Louisiana is in favor of this resolution. We have more at stake, in connection with this problem, we suffer more from floods, and expend more money on flood protection than any other State in this Union. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas, Judge TAYLOR, has just given a description of the loss of property and intense suffering of the people along the valley of the Arkansas River, and has told you that the flood waters of that stream must soon pass into the great Tensas Basin in Louisiana. I live in this great basin, and to show you that the charges made here by a few Members of the House that the appropriations asked for flood protection along the Mississippi is an attempt to secure money to drain private lands in the States affected is totally and wholly unfounded, I will explain that all the levee taxes collected in the Tensas Basin levee district, one of the largest districts in the State of Louisiana, is spent in building levees in the State of Arkansas, in the districts represented here by Mr. GOODWIN, Mr. CARAWAY, and Judge TAYLOR, and for the purpose of protecting the lands in that great district from just such floods as seem imminent at this time.

The fifth congressional district of Louisiana has a frontage of 200 miles along the Mississippi River, all protected by great levees, constructed by the State, the various levee boards, in connection with the Federal Government. The lands are taxed, the produce is taxed, and the citizens of that district are contributing voluntarily and gladly all the means and energy within their power, and it is our firm conviction, after years of study and experiment, that the rich domain of the Mississippi Valley, and the valleys of its tributary rivers can be protected, can be made available for habitation and cultivation, and that it will become, when so protected and made available for settlement and cultivation, the richest and the most prosperous section of this Republic; that it will add more to the national wealth and provide better homes for our overteeming population than can be secured by any other means or in any other section of this country. No one doubts that this is a national problem.

Every political party has so acknowledged in its platform and each President for four administrations has so declared, and it should and must be dealt with as such.

All the great engineers who have studied and dealt with this problem have been convinced and declared that these valleys can be protected, and experience with like problems in other countries confirm their opinions. The money and the means for this purpose should be provided, not as a donation or a gift, but in the high and noble discharge of a supreme national duty. The people of my district and of my State are fighting nobly and bravely for the solution of this problem. They remain behind these levees planning and working, carrying the problem with them day and night, striving with a courage and heroism unsurpassed in history, and they are there now with the full confidence and belief that this great Government will come to their relief and provide the means and protection that will add so much to its wealth, to its power, and to its greatness. No man can foresee or describe the possibilities of this section, but we can say that the time is rapidly approaching when this country can not develop and reach the ultimate extent of its manifest destiny without what this great valley, when finally protected and made available, will produce.

The tide of our population has reached its western limit and is now returning toward the east, and the rich lands of the Mississippi Valley is the most inviting field for settlement. Millions of dollars from the North, from the Central States, and from the East have been invested there, and the entire Nation is interested from every standpoint. This resolution is national in its scope and purpose, and will afford the means of solving one of the greatest problems now before the American people, and in the correct solution of which is lodged the prosperity and happiness of millions of our people and the conservation of the greatest asset to our national wealth.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, I hope and believe that the adoption of this resolution will be the beginning of what I am persuaded every man considers the greatest internal improvement enterprise that this Nation has ever undertaken. I am sure that it lies back in the mind of every man who has given any attention to this flood problem that the present organization of committees of this House has made it practically impossible to do these things that everybody admits should be done with the flood problem, especially in the Mississippi Valley.

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors feel themselves naturally compelled to stay in the stream when much, if not most, of the work that needs to be done must needs at times be done at some distance from the stream. The improvement of navigation will be a part of this problem and incidental to the work that must come out of it. The conservation of land that will eventually be of almost priceless worth to the Nation will also be incidental. Both things will be wrought out eventually by a program that we as well as the business men of this Nation realize that we might just as well get ourselves ready to carry out, and that is to take care of that river problem from the Gulf upward, so that it can no longer devastate the hundreds of thousands of acres of the best land on earth, and save it for the people of the world, and not alone for those in that territory. [Applause.]

I hope that the resolution, which has been offered by a gentleman who certainly understands the English language, will pass, and that this rule will go through. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire about the time again?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has 14 minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] has 18 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. There will probably be only one other speech on this side.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended until this very moment to take any time on this resolution. The gentleman to whom I had given the time has just sent word that he will not be here.

I favored this resolution in the committee, and I favor it here, because I believe that it will result in some good. The question of the conflict of jurisdiction between the proposed committee and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors gives me very little trouble. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors no doubt does a great deal of good. The Mississippi River has been the recipient of a great deal of attention from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, with a view to promoting navigation. But

navigation has decreased as their attention to the river has increased in the last 25 years. There is practically no navigation on the Mississippi River.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if he knew how much tonnage is carried on the Mississippi River?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not know what it is, but I know that it is not one-tenth of what it was 10 years ago.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thought the gentleman did not know.

Mr. CAMPBELL. And I know that it is not one-tenth of what it was 40 years ago. I know that if some committee having jurisdiction over the subject matter will undertake the prevention of floods, the inundation of large areas of land, that committee will accomplish some benefit to the people of the United States. The people are not suffering for want of navigation. The fact that they do not use the waters they already have justifies that statement. They do suffer from floods and overflows of streams throughout the entire country.

I accepted on one occasion a very important chairmanship of a committee in this House—the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River. A vast number of bills and resolutions were referred to that committee from every section of the United States. While it referred only to the Mississippi River, every stream that finally flowed into the Mississippi River claimed that it should have attention from the Congress of the United States, and those resolutions and bills were of course referred to the only committee that had anything to do with rivers at all and did not deal solely with navigation. The committee had no power to report bills, because it dealt with the improvement of the Mississippi River and all of its tributaries, under the authorities cited to the committee and such as were available to the committee, and that fact prevented any sort of action beneficial to the country, such as it is hoped will result from the creation of this committee and from the work that it shall do.

I do not belittle the work of the Committee on Harbors, but I magnify the importance of the work that may be done by the committee that is proposed to be created by this resolution, and I therefore give it my unqualified support.

Mr. Speaker, I turn over the remainder of my time, if I have any, to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has used six minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. I understand, and I suppose the House understands, that the previous question has been ordered. That was the agreement by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That was the agreement, that the previous question be considered as ordered.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] is recognized for 16 minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I am greatly obliged to Brother MANN for his compliments to me, and I endorse what he said about my three illustrious predecessors under whom I served.

This resolution or rule was introduced for the sole purpose of investigating what I think is the greatest economic question that the American people must deal with in the next quarter of a century; and for the subsidiary purpose of expediting the business of the House.

Before I forget it I wish to say that there is not a committee in the House, in my judgment, that works more faithfully, earnestly, and industriously than does the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. [Applause.]

The history of committees in this House is very interesting. In the first instance, and for years, there were no standing committees in the House. When Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg called the First Congress to order under the Constitution he presided over 56 men. Rhode Island and North Carolina had not yet gotten into the Union. After they came in he had a House of 65 Members. There are 435 Members of this House. The day that President Wilson and myself went over to Philadelphia to rededicate the old Congressional Hall I figured it out that if we had the same ratio now for membership that we had under the first census, and the same population we have now, we would have 2,776 Members in this House.

Government is not an exact science. It is an experimental science. The conduct of the House is not an exact science. It is an experimental science. Originally a special committee was appointed for every particular bill or resolution. That was all right as long as they had 65 Members or a few more. As the

membership of the House increased the standing committees came about as a result of parliamentary evolution. There ought to be enough of them to transact the business of the House, and no more. There ought not to be any dead committees around here.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is entirely correct in his criticism of the abolition of the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River. That committee had fallen into what President Cleveland called "inocuous desuetude," growing partly out of the fact of the narrow jurisdiction that it had, and partly out of the fact that the Speakers for some reason referred every bill that they could to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. The Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River ought never to have been abolished. Everybody makes mistakes, and that was one of the small mistakes that we have made since we got hold of the House. [Laughter.] It is a minor mistake. That committee ought to have been revived and its jurisdiction enlarged and made certain, so as to embrace the whole country. The other day I resurrected a sleeping committee in this House, the Committee on Railways and Canals. That committee has been in existence ever since I have been here, and if it ever did anything I never heard of it. Some gentlemen introduced bills about canals, and I referred them to the Committee on Railways and Canals. I think the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has been exercising that jurisdiction for some time; but I notified the chairman of the Committee on Railways and Canals that I wanted his committee to go to work and consider these bills, and he was very eager to do it. So much for that.

There are certain committees in this House—not very many—which are overworked; which have more work than they can attend to. In my judgment, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors is one of them. It does not have any subcommittees, so each member of that committee is supposed to be informed about all the rivers and harbors in America, and that is too much to expect of any 21 gentlemen.

The Committee on Appropriations is overworked, although I do not see any way in the world to relieve it. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is overworked. Sometimes gentlemen on that committee suggest that I take away bills that ought to go to that committee. I take away from it every bill that I have a good excuse for passing to any other committee, simply because that committee does more work than any other committee in this House, barring perhaps the Appropriations Committee. It has too large a task. Human energy has its limitations.

In the days gone by the House has not been at all tenderfooted about creating a new committee when it needed it. It may surprise some of you to know that originally the Ways and Means Committee discharged all the functions of the Committee on Appropriations. When the Civil War came on, however, it created such a vast amount of business that went to the Ways and Means Committee, and so much more business that ought to have gone to an Appropriations Committee that Hon. Thaddeus Stevens, one of the ablest men that ever sat in the House of Representatives, who was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee—perhaps it was on account of his poor health—had that committee cut in two—Ways and Means and Appropriations—and he chose to be chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. So for years the Committee on Appropriations reported all the appropriations in this House, until the Carlisle wing of the Democratic Party concluded they would clip the wings of Hon. Samuel J. Randall, who was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, because he always moved to strike out the enacting clause of a Democratic tariff bill or to strike out everything after the enacting clause, which amounted to the same thing exactly. They did not want to demote him in terms, so they simply resorted to the process of clipping his wings, by giving the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, and other committees the right to bring in appropriation bills. All this is by way of preface.

In my judgment, the control of floods and incidentally the drainage of overflowed lands is, as I said before, the greatest economic question to which the American mind is going to be directed in the next 25 years. When I was a child my father used to put me to sleep of a night by singing to me a song that—

Uncle Sam is rich enough to give us all a farm—

And at that time Uncle Sam was rich enough to do that; but now all of his good land is gone, and men who have children lie awake o' nights studying about where their children are going to find homes in the days to come. Now, here we are. There is enough overflowed land on the Mississippi River and its tributaries—I take that simply because it is the greatest

river system on the face of the earth—every acre of that land equal to the best acre of land under the sun, to make a State as big as the State of Missouri, which has 69,815 square miles of territory. This overflowed land lies right in the heart of civilization, with churches and schoolhouses and railroads and markets, and all of the facilities for American life. If that land was drained and put under cultivation it would support a population of 25,000,000 human beings. Now, I do not believe that Congress is ever going to drain the public lands, or the private lands either at public expense, but I will tell you what I believe it will do. It will rig up a scheme like the irrigation scheme, except exactly the reverse as to the subject matter, by which these overflowed lands will be drained and the men who own the lands will pay for the drainage.

I am one of the men that got up the irrigation scheme. I was not very prominent in it for I was a new Member and green, but I did the best I could. It took years to get it. A man who took any part in that irrigation scheme can not ride from here to California over any great railroad route without rejoicing that he participated in that beneficent work. [Applause.]

The theory of irrigation is that all the irrigation works will be completed and not cost the Government a single cent. It is the same way with the drainage business. Last year, I undertake to say without fear of contradiction, that in the great States of Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, and Iowa alone there was destroyed a hundred million dollars worth of corn, wheat, and other foodstuffs that the people of the world ought to have had to eat.

The River and Harbor Committee had so much work to do—it was not any lack of intention, but it is so occupied with legitimate duties and it had a very shadowy kind of jurisdiction over this question—that it had not the time to attend to it. So, after consulting with several people—I could not consult with everybody—I introduced this resolution for the purpose of appointing a committee whose sole business it shall be to investigate from the best sources of information attainable to see if it is possible to prevent this destruction of property and life by curtailing the overflows of the rivers. It so happened that last year was an extraordinarily rainy year in the Mississippi Valley. It rained 12 or 15 inches more between Pittsburgh and the dry belt in the extreme West than usual. These floods were extraordinary; but at this very minute a great flood is working vast destruction.

I will confess that I do not know whether it is possible to control these floods at all; but from the way we have been going I know that we would never find out whether it was possible or not. The only thing to do, it seems to me, is to appoint a committee that will take the best advice it can get, see if a system can be devised to curtail, if that is the word, the vast amount of water that goes down the rivers, overflowing the whole country, and make them go down more gradually.

The truth is that what tends to make these great floods more than anything else is that the whole country is nearly denuded of trees and foliage. The water which took when we were boys, or before we were born, two weeks to seep into the streams runs down the furrows into the streams now in 24 or 48 hours. Something has got to be done about it.

In the meantime, if they can devise a scheme that will meet the indorsement of Congress and the country, make suggestions as to how to drain the overflowed land, they ought to do that. There has been some controversy here to-day about what jurisdiction this committee will have. If the resolution passes, as soon as the committee is organized I am going to refer to that committee all the bills having reference to the question of drainage and overflow, and that committee will have enough to do. And remember the proposed new committee can not report appropriations—not a penny. I am in favor of constituting the committee. I have no personal interest in it except that I happen to live in a district that is bordered on one side by the Mississippi, split wide open by the Missouri, and has in it four other rivers, navigable by act of Congress, and in no other way. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. The previous question having been ordered, the question now is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of further considering the bill 10385, the Indian appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. FOSTER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10385, the Indian appropriation bill, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For commencing the construction of a dam with bridge superstructure and necessary controlling works for diverting water from the Gila River for the irrigation of Indian land and allotments on the Gila River Indian Reservation, Ariz., as recommended by the Board of Engineers of the United States Army in paragraph 217 of its report to the Secretary of War of February 14, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 791), \$75,000, to remain available until expended, reimbursable under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, the total cost not to exceed \$200,000.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that paragraph.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. BORLAND. I will reserve the point of order if the gentleman wants to make a speech.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the gentleman will read the hearings before the committee, he will find that this appropriation is amply justified. The department asked for an appropriation of \$200,000 for this purpose, but the committee thought best to advance but \$75,000 at this time, limiting the total cost of the project to \$200,000. The United States has already constructed at great expense a canal on the north side of the Gila River which irrigates 10,000 acres of Indian land. There is a similar canal on the south side, but the Indians do not get the full benefit of these canals, although they have tried to do the best they can with brush diversion dams. This appropriation is justified by the report of a board of Army engineers appointed by direction of the Congress to look into this matter. I would like to know on what grounds the gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order, and if he has any justification for his attitude in the matter.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, this work here is estimated to cost \$200,000, but so far as I know that is a very small estimate and probably an underestimate. There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, but what it is new legislation subject to a point of order. Now, as to the justification, I might say this about it. As I understand, the Gila River carries very little water anyway, and all the irrigation that is possible is by diverting the flood water.

It is possible to occasionally divert water from the floods of the Gila River, but unless there are built storage works on the Gila River near the headwaters of the river there is no permanent source of water in the Gila River. The project has been fully considered several times by the Reclamation Commission and has been universally condemned by them as a business proposition. It is feasible from an engineering standpoint, because the Army engineers say so, but I doubt very much whether they can limit the cost to \$200,000 or whether it would be feasible even at that. This proposition, as I understand it, contemplates only a diversion canal. That could not store any water.

Mr. HAYDEN. It does not contemplate the storage of any water.

Mr. BORLAND. And there is no water available there for constant irrigation without some storage works.

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman will remember that when he visited the Salt River project he saw the diversion dam at Granite Reef, and that it cost very much less than the reservoir.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. And if the farmers in the Salt River Valley to-day were compelled either to do without the Roosevelt Reservoir and maintain the Granite Reef Dam or have the reservoir and do without a permanent diversion dam, they would prefer to do without the reservoir. The people in all countries where they get water from torrential streams lose more by floods than they do by droughts. I was born under a canal system where we irrigate about 20,000 acres, and formerly we built little brush dams just as the Pima Indians do. A flood would come along and wash the dam out, and before we could repair it the flood had passed, so that there was no water for irrigation. Now we have a permanent diversion dam and we get the benefit of every flood that comes. That is what these Indians can do, and it is absolutely necessary that such a permanent diversion dam be constructed in order to properly cultivate their lands on the Pima Reservation.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman knows as well as I do that in that country a diversion dam without storage works is practically ineffective.

Mr. HAYDEN. On the contrary, such a dam is of immense benefit.

Mr. BORLAND. The whole proposition has been on the Gila River to create storage works, and that particular storage-works proposition has been an alternative proposition with the

Salt. When the Salt River was adopted it was because it was considered a better proposition than the Gila. In other words, the Gila was condemned.

Mr. HAYDEN. This appropriation is justified on its own merits, whether any storage works are ever built on the Gila River or not.

Mr. BORLAND. I want to say further to the gentleman that irrigation has not proceeded very rapidly for the white settlers. That is, the white settlers have not been able to avail themselves, even under favorable conditions, of the advantages of irrigation, but it has not proceeded rapidly at all for the Indians. In the Blackfeet Reservation they have spent nearly a million dollars of money, which is supposed to be reimbursable—though whether it will be or not I do not know—on that Two Medicine Lake diversion dam and storage works for the Blackfeet Indians. About 26,000 acres can be furnished with water. It was originally calculated at 40,000 acres. Out of those 26,000 acres last year 600 were cultivated, and this year it is said that perhaps a thousand acres will be cultivated. In other words, it has cost the Indians, if they pay for it, \$900 an acre for storage works, and that does not take into consideration the maintenance of those works, and if you assess the maintenance of those works against the Indians, even while bringing them under cultivation, you would find that the cost was so prohibitive that the Indians would not do it.

Mr. HAYDEN. The difference between an Indian irrigation project in Montana and one in Arizona is this: When the first Spaniards came into Arizona they found the Pima Indians watering their crops. They are familiar with irrigation and know what to do with any irrigation works that may be provided for them. You take a blanket Indian, accustomed to hunting on the prairies, bring him onto a reservation, and although you may give him the benefit of the very best irrigation works, yet he does not know how to take advantage of water for irrigation. You will find that the Pimas in all their history have made beneficial use of all the water that they could get. They have been deprived of their water by appropriations farther up the stream, but they will use this diversion dam and use it well. If the gentleman will take the trouble to read the hearings, he will find that all the money heretofore spent on the Pimas for irrigation has been profitably expended.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have read the hearings, and they were very much less in their scope than the hearings we have already had on that same subject. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the hearings we have had on this very same subject when we had this proposition under consideration last year, and I want to say in this connection that the next item following is the same proposition, so that what I will read applies to both of them.

This is in relation to the San Carlos project, and I read from the hearings of last year:

Mr. BORLAND. You are also being importuned to start a project at San Carlos on the Gila?

Mr. NEWELL. That is a matter before Congress. I have been in former years enthusiastic about it, but as the years have gone by I have become less and less so. The last examination was ordered by Congress and was put into the hands of the Army engineers, rather than into our hands, it being thought possibly we were not as optimistic as we might be.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that Mr. Newell has reported in favor of that?

Mr. BORLAND. He says so, and he says that further experience convinced him. He says:

The report of that board is extremely interesting. It shows that on the basis of the water supply that we are furnishing to the Salt River Valley it will cost, I think, nearly \$144 an acre. But they propose to furnish only 2 acre-feet per acre at the land, while we furnish at the head of the canal 4.5 acre-feet, based on many years of experience. If they furnish as much water as we do, it will cut the project down, I think, to about 44,000 acres, barely enough for the area on the Indian reservation.

He says this will not furnish over 2 acre-feet, and that it will require $4\frac{1}{2}$ acre-feet per man:

Mr. BORLAND. So the report has been rather unfavorable to the Government carrying on the San Carlos project?

Mr. NEWELL. I would not say unfavorable; it has simply pointed out the difficulty, and that we should not go into the San Carlos project expecting to get as good a supply as we have on the Salt River project at the same price.

And further down:

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Newell, in addition to the very considerable cost, or estimated cost, per acre of the irrigation of the lands on the Gila, I recall that former examinations there developed the fact, or was said to have developed the fact, that the Gila carries enormous quantities of silt, and that any storage reservoir built would fill up with silt in a few years. And the later examinations bore out those former statements or former expressions of opinion relative to the silt.

Mr. NEWELL. In general they have. The accumulation of silt is a most serious problem. The Board of Army Engineers in reporting upon

It recommended that after a certain number of years works should be built or devices installed for getting rid of the silt—

And so forth.

Mr. BORLAND. So that you see that the cost of such a work will—

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman will be fair enough to the House to state that what he has read relates only to storage works?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. What I am talking about is a diversion dam, a totally separate and distinct matter, and which stands on its own merits and has nothing to do with the San Carlos project.

Mr. BORLAND. I think the gentleman will agree with the experience of this House, that if we spend \$75,000 or \$200,000 in starting some diversion works there, the next step will be storage works, because complaint will be made, and based upon good evidence, that the particular works we have built are not available until they get some storage. When they get the storage, then they will do the same way, and say they will not be available until some method is provided for relieving the river of silt. In other words, the estimate is not anywhere near complete.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have offered this amendment in good faith, and I believe that the works can be constructed within the amount stated. The two diversion dams stand on their merits and have nothing whatever to do with the construction of a reservoir at San Carlos.

Mr. BORLAND. I insist it is hardly a beginning of what is going to be a great big project, a project of perhaps \$6,000,000.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If the gentleman will permit a suggestion, the object of these diversion dams is the same as every other diversion dam at various points in the West. I have in mind the Rio Grande. It is to stop the underflow underneath the sand and silt, so that these diversion dams will hold water that will be turned loose through the ditches on the farms below, whereas if there is no diversion dam it will sink underneath the sand, and every man who lives in the West knows that under the quicksand of these broad rivers in the West, this one especially, you can dig down 1 or 2 feet and get plenty of water, and then if you can stop the underflow from escaping you can impound it. That is why these diversion dams are built down to hardpan, either clay or something impervious to water, so it can not seep through.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. I make the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will reserve the point of order if he intends to make it.

Mr. BORLAND. If possible, I will reserve it.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I agree very largely with what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has said. I think, however, that what he said applies to the following item rather than to this item. I am of the opinion that it would not be wise to adopt the following item without further consideration of the matter by Congress, because the item is clearly a feature of a great project on the Gila, which would cost, as the gentleman from Missouri suggests, at least \$6,000,000. But the item now under discussion is not necessarily a part of that general project. I think there is objection to the language of the paragraph which says, "as recommended by the Board of Army Engineers." As a matter of fact, the Board of Army Engineers did not, as I recall, recommend a diversion dam at this point.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the gentleman will pardon me, in the finding of the board, page 65 of the report, to the Secretary of War—

(d) That in case the project is not undertaken until after an adjudication, a diversion dam on the reservation be constructed to improve irrigation conditions on the Pima Reservation.

In other words, whether the reservoir is constructed or not, this diversion dam ought to be built immediately.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MONDELL. In a moment. That particular suggestion of the Board of Engineers had escaped me. What I had in mind was that the diversion dam which was proposed by the Board of Engineers was not a diversion dam at this point, but at an entirely different point. What I started to say was this: The Board of Army Engineers did not, as a matter of fact, recommend this project at all, except under certain conditions, to wit, if on investigation it was discovered that there was a sufficient water supply available, if it was discovered that certain conditions might be met as to the acre cost.

Quite a number of "ifs" in the recommendations of the board, but none of those "ifs," so far as I know, have been met.

Mr. HAYDEN. All of those "ifs" were as to the construction of the storage reservoir; but there are no "ifs and ands"

about the construction of this diversion dam, as recommended by the Army board.

Mr. MONDELL. I agree with the gentleman from Arizona, that while this is expensive work for what it would probably accomplish, it would, in the first place, give the people a good bridge at this point, and that, in my opinion, is a meritorious feature of the proposition.

Mr. HAYDEN. I will be perfectly willing to see the bridge feature stricken out rather than see the whole appropriation fail.

Mr. MONDELL. I think the gentleman ought to leave the bridge feature in it. I think it is an important one, and it does not greatly increase the cost of the structure very much. The structure would make available, more than at the present time, the waters of the Gila River for irrigation through the ditch that was made by the Reclamation Service.

Mr. BORLAND. Now, the gentleman is more familiar technically and practically with irrigation than any man in this House. As I understand from the hearings on this particular item, they now have a ditch there?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Which is intended to divert the flood waters of the Gila, or whatever water there is in the Gila, and that ditch has not been sufficient, because there is no water in the Gila at the irrigating season of the year. Would this dam supply water for that ditch throughout the irrigating season of the year?

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman from Missouri had read the hearings in the matter—

Mr. BORLAND. I did read them.

Mr. MONDELL. I mean the hearings before the Committee on Indian Affairs—

Mr. BORLAND. I did so.

Mr. MONDELL. He would recall that the lock diversion dam at the intake of the ditch of the Reclamation Service—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am withholding my point of order for that purpose.

Mr. MONDELL. As I said, he would recall the fact that the lack of a diversion dam at that point rendered the ditch that had been built for the Reclamation Service of comparatively little value. That is the situation, as I understand it.

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman from Wyoming states what is exactly true.

Mr. MONDELL. And this diversion dam would at least do this. That it is going to be beneficial there can be no question, because, first, it will make that ditch heretofore built by the Government available so far as there is water in the river. It will make it available much later in the season than it is now, and it will prevent the heading being constantly and annually washed out; second, it will make possible the building of a ditch on the other side, if that is advisable, for the use of water on the other side of the river, and undoubtedly it will add very much to the value of what they already have there in the way of development. In addition to that, I am still inclined to think that the bridge feature of it is one that should not be overlooked, because there is an enormous stretch of country that would be benefited.

Mr. BORLAND. It is clear from what the gentleman says that the whole plan is problematic. Its benefit to the Indians is entirely problematic and has not been worked out by these engineers, who are specially charged with it.

Mr. MONDELL. But what I want to emphasize is this: That this work will be of a very considerable benefit. It will make useful a project we already have, and this particular work does not in any way necessarily involve entering upon the large project.

Mr. BORLAND. I think the gentleman will agree with me that we have entered hastily into these irrigation projects in the hope that they would do some good, and in many cases we have been disappointed. And this is particularly true with these Indian projects, because we always hear that the amounts spent are reimbursable from the Indians, and if they do not do any good the Indians will have to pay for them anyway. But that is not always the case. I think if we have a scientific body especially charged with that kind of work of irrigation we ought to defer to their opinion about the practicability of these works and not go into the matter simply because of the hope that they may do some good.

Mr. HAYDEN. This matter has been investigated by two different authorities: First, by a board of Army engineers, who were on the ground and spent \$25,000 in making the investigation; and, second, by the engineers of the Indian Service, who

have been on the ground and have drawn plans and specifications for the dam and bridge and estimated the cost. I can not see why the gentleman continues to talk about a storage reservoir and says nothing about this diversion dam.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Davis says:

Yes, sir. I wish to say, though, that I do not agree with that report and never did.

Mr. BORLAND. You did not agree with that report?

Mr. A. P. DAVIS. No, sir; it was issued before I came back from Nicaragua.

Mr. BORLAND. What discrepancy did you find in that report?

Mr. A. P. DAVIS. I thought the area to be irrigated was overestimated and the cost was greatly underestimated.

That is the same man who is still in charge of the Reclamation Service. Mr. Newell was the former chief, and this is the present chief.

Mr. MONDELL. Let me call my friend's attention to the fact, as the gentleman from Arizona is attempting to do, that what he is discussing is not the proposition we have now before us.

Mr. BORLAND. I think I understand he is not discussing the San Carlos Dam or the proposition at Florence, but he is discussing simply this diversion dam to divert water for the Pima Indians. That is a part of this general plan, which, in general, has been condemned. The only question is whether—and it is a very serious question—this \$200,000 dam can be built and the land can respond to its cost as a single proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has expired. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] make the point of order?

Mr. BORLAND. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think the point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For beginning the construction by the Indian Service of a dam and necessary controlling works for diverting water from the Gila River at a site above Florence, Ariz., for the irrigation of Indian lands on the Gila River Indian Reservation and private and public lands in Pinal County, Ariz., as estimated by the Board of Engineer Officers of the United States Army in paragraph 138 of its report to the Secretary of War of February 14, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 791), \$75,000, to remain available until expended, the total cost not to exceed \$175,000: *Provided*, That the water diverted from the Gila River by said dam shall be distributed by the Secretary of the Interior to the Indian lands of said reservation and to the private and public lands in said county in accordance with the respective rights and priorities of such lands to the beneficial use of said water as may be determined by a court of competent jurisdiction: *Provided further*, That the construction charge for the actual cost of said dam and other works shall be divided pro rata by the Secretary of the Interior between the Indian lands and the public and private lands in said county in accordance with the area of land entitled to water, as decreed by said court; and said charge as fixed for said Indian lands shall be reimbursable as provided in section 2 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. L., p. 522); but the construction charge as fixed for the public and private lands in said county shall be paid by the owner or entryman in accordance with the terms of an act extending the period of payment under reclamation projects, approved August 13, 1914.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order for a moment?

Mr. BORLAND. I will, long enough to give the gentleman a chance to make a statement about it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation for the construction of a diversion dam on the Gila River above Florence has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior in a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, which is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, January 21, 1916.

MY DEAR MR. STEPHENS: Further consideration has been given the draft of an amendment intended to be made to the Indian appropriation bill, for the construction of a dam across the Gila River above Florence, Ariz., referred with your letter of December 24, 1915, requesting the views of this department thereon.

The proposed work meets the approval of this department. The provisions under which the money is to be expended relating to the control of the works, the water to be diverted thereby, and the reimbursement to the United States thereof by the owners of lands irrigable thereunder, seem to provide satisfactorily for the management and financing of the project. In order that there may be no question of the supervision of the construction of this dam, it is recommended that the words "by the Indian Service" be inserted in line 1, after the word "construction."

The amount proposed to be appropriated is \$100,000, which is only part of the total cost of \$175,000. For a structure of this kind it is believed that serious risk would be run in attempting to build only part of it, owing to the danger from floods and the shifting channels of the Gila River. It is therefore recommended that the amount to be appropriated be increased to \$175,000, and that the item be amended by striking out the figures "\$175,000" and substituting therefor the words "said sum" (line 13). This change would make it necessary to strike out the word "beginning" in the first line.

The second page of the proposed amendment contains a reference to the act of August 24, 1914, as the act under which reimbursement by the Indians of their proportionate cost of the project is to be made.

This is apparently a typographical error, as no doubt the act of August 24, 1912, is intended.

A similar item which was included in the bill H. R. 20150, Sixty-third Congress, second session, was the subject of my report of January 28, 1915, a copy of which is inclosed and which has been printed in the hearings before the Committee on Indian Affairs of the United States Senate, volume 1, page 498 et seq.

In addition to the information therein exhibited, the proposed work will benefit a large number of Indians on the Gila River Reservation, approximately 3,000, by providing under existing conditions for the diversion of water to irrigate an area of over 20,000 acres of fine agricultural land on the reservation. With storage provided, the area of land would be limited only by the available water supply.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE, Secretary.

Hon. JOHN H. STEPHENS,

Chairman Committee on Indian Affairs, House of Representatives.

A similar item was included in the Indian appropriation bill in the Senate last year. That bill failed to become a law owing to the filibuster at the close of the session. In his report made at that time the Secretary of the Interior said:

JANUARY 28, 1915.

MY DEAR SENATOR ASHURST: I have received your communication of January 19, 1915, requesting report upon a proposed amendment to the Indian bill making an appropriation of \$75,000 for beginning the construction of a dam and necessary controlling works for diverting water from the Gila River at a site above Florence, Ariz., for the irrigation of Indian land and allotments on the Gila River Indian Reservation and private lands in Pinal County, as estimated by the Board of Engineer Officers of the United States Army in its report to the Secretary of War, page 46, paragraphs 138-138 (H. Doc. 791, 63d Cong., 2d sess.).

This report describes the situation with regard to the diversion dam which it will be necessary to construct in order to utilize the waters of the Gila River when the San Carlos Dam is built. However, the usefulness of this diversion dam does not depend entirely upon the construction of the San Carlos Reservoir, because for many years past considerable areas of land have been irrigated by diversion through various headings of the flood flow of the Gila River above Florence. To irrigate the lands of the Pima Indian Reservation upon the south side of the Gila River at the upper or eastern end of the reservation will require the construction of such a dam in order to conserve the flow of the river to as great an extent as possible. The proposed site, about 12 miles above Florence, is at the mouth of a series of canyons through which the river flows uninterruptedly from San Carlos, but from this point on the river course is through a broad flat valley, with an immense river bed, consisting of broad deep deposits of silt and gravel. When the flow of the river is low, and when, of course, water is most valuable, the stream disappears entirely soon after emerging from the mountains above Florence.

Aside from the use which the Indian reservation may eventually make of this diversion dam, practically all of the landowners off the reservation who have been irrigating in this vicinity may receive their supply of flood water from this point of diversion.

The Gila River has just experienced one of the most disastrous floods in its history, and all the headings of the various canals above Florence have been washed away, and the earth covering through which these canals ran has been entirely removed, so that these channels can not be again constructed. The superintendent of the reservation reports also that at least one canal heading for the Indian reservation, on the south side of the river, is washed out, and the large canal, known as the Little Gila, has been very badly damaged. The land which this canal supplies with water could be reached from channels heading at the diversion dam which it is proposed to build, and when so supplied would be past all danger of future damage or destruction.

The white owners who have suffered by the recent floods might possibly secure means of constructing a dam at the point mentioned, thus insuring to themselves immunity from a recurring flood, but it might be necessary for the Government to oppose such a step in order to protect the water right now claimed for the Indians.

While there is no doubt but that, as a matter of law, the Pima Indians have a prior right to the waters of the Gila River as against all other appropriators on that stream, yet they have not been receiving a sufficient quantity of water to irrigate their lands for lack of the physical means of obtaining the same. The construction of a diversion dam at this point will give the Indians an advantage of location that they have not heretofore enjoyed, because the Government of the United States will thus actually control the only feasible point where the waters of the Gila may be diverted. The Indians are entitled to control this strategic position in order to adequately preserve and perpetuate the Government's claim to water in their behalf, and for this reason alone, whether the San Carlos Reservoir is ever constructed or not, this appropriation is amply justified.

The cost of the diversion dam itself is estimated by the board of Army engineers as \$150,000, and an additional item of \$25,000 should be included in order to make the necessary excavation through the rock heading, so that connection may be made with the present canal systems of the Florence district. The site of the proposed diversion is an ideal one compared with others along the Gila River, as on both sides of the river are massive outcroppings of rock. The river bed is comparatively narrow and confined between hills to this one channel, and a railroad upon which to bring in supplies and materials parallels the river at this point, so that the cost would be the minimum for such work. The railroad track is high enough above the river so that no interference with its operation will result even after the dam is built. The dam will not be high enough for storage purposes, but simply a low weir a few feet above the normal surface of the river, so that water may be properly diverted into the canal, and that all of the flow at the low stages, when the water is most valuable, and which occur for long periods, may be available.

It is recommended that the proposed amendment receive favorable consideration by Congress.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE,

Hon. H. F. ASHURST,

Chairman Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate.

That a diversion dam can be constructed for the amount named in this bill is shown by the report of the Board of Engineer officers of the Army, three paragraphs of which discuss this subject:

136. At the several sites for a diversion dam ledge rock is found at one or both abutments, but investigation has shown that toward the

center of the river rock is not within practicable reach. However, for the lift desired, not to exceed 10 feet, a dam of the Indian type will answer.

137. Through the courtesy of Mr. G. S. Binkley, member of the American Society of Civil Engineers, the board has been able to consult the design for a diversion dam for this place prepared by the late Mr. J. D. Schuyler in 1911 and a later design prepared by Messrs. Schuyler and Binkley.

138. From a consideration of these designs and the quantities of materials required for a dam following the second design the board is able to state that the cost of the diversion dam, including head gate and silt sluice, need not exceed \$150,000.

Worse floods than the high water in the Gila mentioned in the original report of the Secretary of the Interior have recently occurred, as is shown by this telegram which I have received from Mr. F. H. Thackery, the superintendent at Sacaton:

SACATON VIA CASA GRANDE, ARIZ., February 3, 1916.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,

House of Representatives, Washington D. C.:

Recent flood damage to Indian lands and canals is more than \$100,000 on Pima Reservation. Immediate relief urgent.

THACKERY, Superintendent.

I have also received three other telegrams which will give the House an idea of the necessity for this appropriation:

FLORENCE, ARIZ., February 3, 1916.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN, M. C.,

Washington:

Recent flood of Gila River damaged various canals and heads and other properties of white settlers to amount of \$40,000. Have conferred with Thackery, superintendent Pima Indian Reservation, and he estimates their damage sustained by same flood as not less than \$100,000.

E. W. COKER.

CASA GRANDE, ARIZ., February 2, 1916.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.:

Conditions here serious. Demand prompt attention to avoid great suffering. Canals badly broken. Head gates and dams all washed out. Much other damage done by recent floods. Three thousand Indians and large number of white settlers dependent on waters of Gila River to mature crops. Unless something is done immediately will be left in destitute circumstances. Appropriation should be made and work started on diversion dam above Florence at once. Such dam would solve problem and be salvation of country.

J. F. BROWN.

CASA GRANDE, ARIZ., February 2, 1916.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Chamber of Commerce of Casa Grande, Ariz., urges passage of your amendment in Indian appropriation bill for diversion dam on Gila River above Florence. Absolutely necessary to enable Indians, settlers, and farmers to save crops. Situation most critical. Temporary dams out by recent floods. Much suffering unless Congress gives relief. Wire result.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
A. A. JAYNE, President.

This calamity which has fallen on the white settlers and Indians alike has forced everybody to recognize that they have a community of interest in the waters of the Gila, and that the only way that these flood waters can be put to a beneficial use is by the construction of a reinforced concrete diversion dam by the Government. These same waters that now spread destruction along the valley of the Gila can thus be controlled and made to serve the irrigators, both red and white, who are most anxious for this relief. The Indians and the white men must live together in this valley for all time to come. They have suffered alike from floods and from drought, and I want to see them prosper together in equal measure, as I know they will if Congress appropriates the money for this diversion dam above Florence.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, this is the larger project that the gentleman was speaking about. When the reclamation law was first passed, one of the projects that was then being considered by the Geological Survey, which had a good deal of influence on passing the bill, was the storage works on the Gila River, but after the law was passed private interests in the Salt River Valley were so much more influential and powerful that they succeeded in killing the Gila River project and in substituting for it the Roosevelt Dam on the Salt River, on which we have expended \$11,000,000. It was thought by some Members at that time that we were making a mistake with respect to the relative advantages of the two projects; that we ought to have gone on with the Gila River project and not undertaken the Salt River project. But in their anxiety to kill the Gila River project, the Salt River interest did it effectually, and they secured various engineer's reports showing that the Gila project was impracticable. The great objection was that a dam on the Gila would fill up with silt in a short time. We asked them during the hearings, "If a dam silts up, what will you do?" and they answered that in India, where such projects were carried on, when a dam silts up they let it go and proceed to build another dam. You will find that given in the testimony.

I am talking about the general project, and I admit that, as a pure business proposition in all these southwestern streams, like

the Gila River and the Salt River, storage works are the essential features. I do not think it would be two sessions of Congress, or maybe one, after action was had here before local interests would be here again asking for storage works. The Government might invest \$400,000 in these two projects, and then it would be argued that it would be a moral crime not to give the people water, and the only way to do that would be to put in storage works.

The local interests secured the Salt River project, and now, on the Indian bill, they are trying to put in the Gila project also, before a dollar has been returned to the Reclamation Service for the construction charges on the other project, although the Salt River Valley is eminently prosperous, as I think the gentleman will admit, and is one of the most beautiful valleys in the world and full of active and energetic and prosperous people.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am coming here asking this Congress for an appropriation for this project on its own merits, it having nothing to do with the construction of the San Carlos Reservoir. Regardless of whether the San Carlos Reservoir is ever constructed or not, this appropriation is amply justified.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona asks unguisous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] makes a point of order on the paragraph. Unless gentlemen wish to be heard further on the point of order, the Chair will rule. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to furnish in perpetuity for the irrigation of 631 Salt River Indian allotments of 10 acres each, to be designated by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, water from works constructed under the provision of the reclamation act, and acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto: *Provided*, That the reclamation fund shall be reimbursed therefor upon terms the same as those provided in said act or acts for reimbursement by entrymen on lands irrigated by said works, and there is hereby appropriated \$20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay the initial installment of the charges when made for said water.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. It may be lack of knowledge or intelligence, but I can not tell from the reading of this paragraph whether this water is to be furnished without the Indians making a contribution for the maintenance charges or not.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Indians take the water out of the main canal and handle it themselves, so there is no charge for maintenance.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has not answered my suggestion at all. The bill says, "The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to furnish in perpetuity," and so forth. That directs him to furnish it. Are they to pay for the maintenance charges of it?

Mr. BORLAND. I think the law already covers that.

Mr. MANN. The law could not cover it, because this is new law.

Mr. BORLAND. The law under which it was begun, as I recollect, provided that the Indians were to contribute a certain amount toward that Salt River project, and they were to have a certain amount of water. What they really got was some wells and a transmission line for power. They were not satisfied with that. Now, it is proposed to give them the water. The original act provided that their lands should be assessed, the same as those of the white settlers.

Mr. HAYDEN. This act says that the Indians shall receive water on an additional area of land within their reservation.

Mr. MANN. What act says that?

Mr. HAYDEN. This section here. The Secretary of the Interior shall furnish water for 6,310 acres of land.

Mr. MANN. Then it provides that the reclamation fund shall be reimbursed therefor on the terms provided in a certain act. If we make an appropriation for maintenance charges, I take it that under the terms of this provision we will make an appropriation every year, probably in perpetuity, for those maintenance charges.

Mr. HAYDEN. Congress will be required to make an appropriation every year for the construction and maintenance charges. Instead of making an appropriation for the whole amount of \$65 an acre for 6,310 acres, we will appropriate the amount that probably will be due next year and so on thereafter.

Mr. MANN. Will the Indian allottees pay their proportionate share of the maintenance charges of this project?

Mr. HAYDEN. They will have to, unless Congress appropriates the money.

Mr. MANN. Suppose they do not do it?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Indians will not get any water until somebody pays for it.

Mr. MANN. The Secretary of the Interior is empowered to furnish in perpetuity this water, whether they pay anything for it or not.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. NORTON. This appropriation here is for the purpose of purchasing the water right. The water right is worth \$65 an acre. That does not pay for the charge each year for water, for the operating expenses, but it pays for the construction charges of the project.

Mr. MANN. I will ask the gentleman from North Dakota the simple, easy, plain question that I have asked already and that no gentleman has answered.

Mr. NORTON. I will answer it.

Mr. MANN. Will these Indian allottees, under this provision, pay their proportion of the maintenance charges of this project?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is sure of that?

Mr. NORTON. Outside of—

Mr. MANN. Oh, not outside of anything.

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman says he is sure about that, I will withdraw the point of order, but I do not want to get fooled on it. I want somebody who knows to answer it. The gentlemen over there on the other side will not answer.

Mr. MONDELL. May I suggest—

Mr. MANN. No; I want somebody on the committee, who is responsible for the item, to make the statement.

Mr. NORTON. I will say to the gentleman that it is not contemplated that out of this item the maintenance charges will be paid; and I will say to the gentleman that I do not know whether they will be paid by the Indian Bureau out of some other fund for the Indians; but I can answer the gentleman as to this item.

Mr. MANN. I am going to hold the gentleman to his first statement. I did not ask anything about the appropriation in this item. Here is a provision directing the Secretary of the Interior to furnish water in perpetuity. He has to do it or he is subject to impeachment, whether they pay anything or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Then I will expire also, and will withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. I renew the point of order, or reserve it, rather.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield to me for a suggestion?

Mr. MONDELL. I was going to say to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] that I do not intend to make the point of order, provided we can amend this paragraph—

Mr. BORLAND. Suppose we strike out all after the word "works," in line 10.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not intend to make the point of order, if we can amend this paragraph so as to make it very clear what we are trying to do.

Mr. BORLAND. Why not strike out all after the word "works," in line 10, page 19, simply providing that the reclamation fund shall be reimbursed upon terms the same as those provided for reimbursement by entrymen, and so forth, and stop there?

Mr. MONDELL. That would strike out this first appropriation.

Mr. BORLAND. That would strike out the first appropriation.

Mr. MONDELL. We do not want to do that.

Mr. BORLAND. That would leave the lands clearly subject to maintenance charges.

Mr. MONDELL. I think an amendment there might be in order; but what I had in mind was to meet the suggestion made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. The language of the section is that the Secretary is authorized and directed to furnish water in perpetuity. Well, that language could only be used properly if in some way or other the Secretary of the Interior as an official had some water rights or some water which he in perpetuity could continue to furnish. What you intend to do is to provide perpetual water rights. That can be done

by striking out the word "furnish" and inserting the words "provide for water rights."

The section would then read that the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to provide for water rights in perpetuity for the irrigation of these lands from the reclamation project.

Mr. HAYDEN. I did not write this section, and I think the amendment suggested by the gentleman is a good one.

Mr. MONDELL. With that language there would be no question but what these lands would be subject to the construction charge, and they would be on the same basis as other lands in regard to charges for maintenance; and if that amendment were adopted, I think the objection, which was a very pertinent one, made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] would be met. On page 19, line 2, I would strike out the word "furnish" and insert the words "provide for water rights."

Mr. Chairman, if I may offer an amendment with a point of order pending—

Mr. BORLAND. I will renew the point of order, but I will yield to the gentleman to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming can not offer an amendment while the point of order is pending.

Mr. MONDELL. I take it that the gentleman from Arizona has no objection.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. I think the item is a very proper one, and I think all those who are familiar with the situation there realize the necessity for some provision whereby these lands which lie under the Salt River project can be irrigated from that project. I want to ask the gentleman from Arizona what his knowledge or information is as to the extent to which these lands have at this time been provided with ditches and laterals. In other words, I would like to know whether this item will necessitate any considerable expenditure by the Reclamation Service.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Indians are irrigating 65,000 or 75,000 acres of land at no expense to the Reclamation Service or anybody else for laterals. They have built their own laterals and they can build such additional ones as are necessary. I do not believe that they will require any aid from the Reclamation Service.

Mr. MONDELL. I am quite certain that the service did build some of these laterals. These lands are many miles from the lands that the gentleman from Missouri has in mind. They are just below where the big canal on the north side takes out of the Salt River. The gentleman will recall that he saw some of these lands from above as a party of which he was a member went over the embankment of the big ditch last summer. I am under the impression there have been some canals built over these lands by the Reclamation Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

[By unanimous consent, Mr. MONDELL was given five minutes more.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I think the item should remain in, but if it does it is important that we should know whether it will require additional appropriation for that project.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The Indians are undertaking to cultivate 7,000 acres of this land, and the water is insufficient. The \$20,000 would be quite an advantage in supplying them with the water that they do not now have. I think it is very necessary unless you desire to cripple the whole irrigation project. There is not a finer body of land or a richer body of land or one more available to the reservation than this is.

Mr. BORLAND. Let me ask the gentleman, Is this \$20,000 reimbursable?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes; the item provides:

That the reclamation fund shall be reimbursed therefor upon terms the same as those provided in said act or acts for reimbursement by entrymen on lands irrigated by said works, and there is hereby appropriated \$20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay the initial installment of the charges when made for said water.

Mr. BORLAND. Do these Indians have any tribal funds?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No; but they have some very valuable land.

Mr. BORLAND. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, against the paragraph; and then I will offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, insert at the head of the page, the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to furnish in perpetuity for the irrigation of 631 Salt River Indian allotments of 10 acres each, to be designated by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, water from works constructed under the provision of the reclamation act, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto: *Provided*, That the reclamation fund shall be reimbursed

therefor upon terms the same as those provided in said act or acts for reimbursement by entrymen on lands irrigated by said works."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. BORLAND. It seems to me there can be no objection to that.

Mr. HAYDEN. It seems to me that that amendment is useless. The Indians have no money and they can not pay for it. If you say they shall get something and you do not appropriate the money for it, it is useless to them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman from Arizona withhold his point of order? I make the suggestion to the gentleman that he allow the amendment to be considered in order, then it is permissible for him to offer an amendment carrying an appropriation. He will only be spiting himself by making the point of order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment by striking out in the second line the word "furnish" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "provide for water rights."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, amend the amendment in line 2 by striking out the word "furnish" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "provide for water rights."

Mr. HAYDEN. That is all right.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. We accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming to the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to add at the end of the amendment the words "and there is hereby appropriated \$20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay the initial charges when made for said water."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by adding, at the end of the amendment, the words "and there is hereby appropriated \$20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay the initial charges when made for said water."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment by striking out the figures "\$20,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "\$25,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming would not be in order. It is an amendment in the third degree. There is an amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] and also an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri as amended.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri by striking out "\$20,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$25,000."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. That would not be in order, as it would be striking out something which the committee has already agreed to. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction of a bridge across the Little Colorado River, at or near the town of Winslow, Ariz., \$15,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be expended until the Secretary of the Interior shall have obtained from the proper authorities of the State of Arizona, or the county of Navajo, satisfactory guarantees of the payment by the said State of Arizona, or by the county of Navajo, of at least one-half of the cost of said bridge, and that the proper authorities of the said State of Arizona, or the said county of Navajo, shall assume full responsibility for, and will at all times maintain and repair, said bridge and the approaches thereto: *And provided further*, That any and all expenses above the amount herein named in connection with the building and maintaining of said bridge shall be borne either by the said State of Arizona or the said county of Navajo.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. For whose benefit is this bridge to be constructed?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Navajo Indians.

Mr. MANN. They have a large fund out there, have they not?

Mr. HAYDEN. They have no tribal funds at all. They have about 9,000,000 acres of land in their reservation.

Mr. MANN. That is "a large fund out there." Why should they not pay for this bridge?

Mr. HAYDEN. It was a mistake that there was not language included in that paragraph providing that the cost of the bridge should be reimbursable, and I should be glad to accept any amendment the gentleman may suggest.

Mr. MANN. I have not prepared an amendment, but I am perfectly willing to let it go over and have the gentleman prepare an amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. I make the point of order, if the gentleman from Illinois withdraws it.

Mr. MANN. I reserve the point of order. The gentleman can make use of that at any time.

Mr. BORLAND. I thought the gentleman was about to withdraw it.

Mr. MANN. No; but I am perfectly willing to have it go over, with the point of order pending, until the gentleman prepares an amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest an amendment, after the word "interior," by inserting the words "and to be reimbursable from any funds now or hereafter placed in the Treasury to the credit of said Indians." That is the language that we have been using right along.

Mr. MANN. I am willing to accept that, and will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then I offer that as an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri insist on the point of order?

Mr. BORLAND. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "interior," in line 21, page 19, insert the following: "And to be reimbursable from any funds now or hereafter placed in the Treasury to the credit of said Indians."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

California.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, having reached "California," I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOSTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 10385, the Indian appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Friday, February 4, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of San Diego Harbor, Cal. (H. Doc. No. 648); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting list of documents and files of papers which are not needed or useful in the transaction of current business of the department and have no permanent value or historical interest (H. Doc. No. 649); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers submitting abstracts of proposals received during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, for materials and labor in connection with works under the Engineer Department (H. Doc. No. 650); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 655) to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars from 1865 to January, 1891, inclusive, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 115), which said bill and report were

referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GANDY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7817) to validate the homestead entry of George S. Clark, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 116), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10537) granting a pension to Peter Harper; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1530) granting a pension to Daniel J. Noonan; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 10749) amending section 3285 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STOUT: A bill (H. R. 10750) permitting the Mondak Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KELLEY: A bill (H. R. 10751) to provide for the purchase of additional land for the erection thereon of an addition to the Federal building at Flint, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 10752) authorizing the establishment of a naval base on the Columbia River, near Astoria, Oreg., and making appropriation for the beginning of construction; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 10753) to entitle accused in criminal cases compulsory process for witnesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10754) to extend the time for filing claims for arrears of pensions under the act approved March 3, 1879; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 10755) to regulate the interstate transportation of immature calves; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10756) to prohibit the slaughter, sale, purchase, shipment, and transportation through interstate commerce of calves and cows under certain conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 10757) to authorize the incorporated town of Juneau, Alaska, to issue bonds for the construction and equipment of schools therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10758) making appropriation for the construction of a jetty and the improvement of Nome Harbor, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10759) making an appropriation for the improvement of Dry Strait, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10760) providing for a survey and removal of the log-jam obstructions to navigation in the Tolovana River, Alaska, and an estimate of the cost of removing the same; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 10761) to provide capital for agricultural development, to create a standard form of investment based upon farm mortgages, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to provide a method of applying postal savings deposits to the promotion of the public welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MCCracken: A bill (H. R. 10762) for the improvement of the Columbia River to the mouth of Snake River within the States of Oregon and Washington; for the improvement of the Snake River in the States of Washington and Idaho to Pittsburg Landing, on said river; and for the improvement of the Clearwater River from its mouth to Orofino in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10763) to extend the provisions of the act of February 8, 1887, as amended, to lands purchased for Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 10764) to amend the naturalization laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10765) making an appropriation for improving the harbor at Santa Cruz, Cal.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 10766) providing for the establishment of a term of the district court for the middle district of Tennessee at Winchester, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESHER: A bill (H. R. 10767) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Almedia Cemetery, in the town of Espy, in the State of Pennsylvania, two bronze cannon or field-pieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KALANIANA'OLE: A bill (H. R. 10768) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 10769) to authorize the issuance of a warrant for the arrest and removal of persons under indictment for offenses against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 10770) to increase the limit of cost of the public building for Wilson, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DAVIS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10771) to make classifications for military and naval service, to promote preparedness, to provide for adequate and efficient national defense, to require that in all naval and military service of the United States, whether in time of peace or war, wealth shall bear and perform its proportional part of the service, and that money shall be made to fight for its country the same as men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 10772) to regulate appointments and promotions in the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 10773) to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 10774) authorizing the Sioux Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 133) making appropriations for the relief of sufferers from floods in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 134) for the relief of the destitute sufferers from the flood waters in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 135) for the relief of the destitute sufferers from flood waters in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WINGO: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 136) for the relief of the destitute sufferers from flood waters in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. Sisson: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 137) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) to amend the Constitution of the United States so that Congress may pass a national divorce law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 15) to authorize the printing of 50,000 copies of document entitled "Soil Reconnaissance in Alaska"; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 10775) granting a pension to Lulu M. Lehman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 10776) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Hazlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10777) granting an increase of pension to Charles Caludius Early; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10778) granting a pension to Mary E. Tanner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10779) granting a pension to William F. Abshier; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10780) granting an increase of pension to John T. McCollister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10781) for the relief of John M. Daniel; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 10782) granting an increase of pension to Daniel S. Kriner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10783) granting a pension to Eliza Speake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10784) granting a pension to Joseph Bessi; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 10785) granting an increase of pension to William B. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10786) granting an increase of pension to William M. Simms; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 10787) granting an increase of pension to John W. Moon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 10788) for the relief of Joseph W. Skill; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10789) for the relief of John A. Ryan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ESTOPINAL: A bill (H. R. 10790) for the relief of Frank Payne Selby; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 10791) for the relief of the occupants of the Tuttle town site; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 10792) for the relief of George F. Nicholson; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10793) granting an increase of pension to Luke R. Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10794) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10795) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10796) granting an increase of pension to James Ratchord; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 10797) for the relief of Jacob F. Schild; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 10798) granting an increase of pension to Jay C. Randall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 10799) for the relief of Edward W. Whitaker; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 10800) granting a pension to Mae Crockett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10801) granting a pension to John R. Jordan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 10802) granting an increase of pension to Matthew Farley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY: A bill (H. R. 10803) granting an increase of pension to Mary Van Wormer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 10804) granting an increase of pension to John List; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESHNER: A bill (H. R. 10805) granting a pension to Jacob M. Stratiff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10806) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Lieb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10807) to correct the military record of John Magill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 10808) granting a pension to William D. Swatzell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10809) granting a pension to Tide Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10810) granting a pension to Louis F. Pampe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 10811) granting a pension to Marcelle M. Muller, Anthony N. Muller, jr., and Maud Muller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 10812) granting an increase of pension to Lewis A. Rominger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10813) granting a pension to Mary E. Donham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10814) for the relief of Andrew B. Ritter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTH: A bill (H. R. 10815) granting an increase of pension to James C. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10816) granting an increase of pension to John Blose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 10817) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McCormick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 10818) granting an increase of pension to Angie O. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 10819) granting a pension to Minnie Riffe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10820) granting an increase of pension to Druilla E. Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 10821) granting a pension to Richard C. McGriff; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10822) granting a pension to Leon W. Sims; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10823) for the relief of the Farmers & Merchants Bank, of Headland, Ala.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 10824) granting a pension to Jacob Hicks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10825) granting a pension to Robert B. Hawkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10826) to complete the military record of Cyrus E. Burnett and for an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10827) to reimburse the Navajo Timber Co. of Delaware for a deposit made to cover the purchase of timber; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10828) to reimburse the Navajo Lumber & Timber Co. of Arizona for a deposit made to cover the purchase of timber; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific coast, urging appropriations for coast and geodetic survey and the Alaskan railroad; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also (by request), memorial of the Ocean-to-Ocean Highway Association, urging adoption of the Pikes Peak highway as the national highway; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Missouri Grain Dealers' Association, indorsing House bill 4646, the Moss bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Cooper College, Kansas, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), memorial of Sons of American Revolution, of Kentucky, urging building a national-archives building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of C. H. Riddall, of Pittsburgh, Pa., against prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens in Pennsylvania, against censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of International Union of United Brewery Workmen of America, against increase of tax on beer, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Brief of Dr. Wilbur F. Crafts, of Washington, D. C., for Federal censorship of films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of F. C. Schoch, George Patchen, William E. Seibel, J. S. Eagan, F. B. Newland, W. H. Dempsey, F. J. Tangher, George Hamilton, L. J. Anderson, Charles L. Kunz, A. C. Hansen, F. C. Sterling, F. A. Miller, Carl Hansen, and E. F. Miller, all of Milwaukee, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of William Bergenthal Co., D. D. Weschler & Sons, Milwaukee Western Malt Co., Louis Schuette, G. A. Fehrs, George McFarlane, Emil Teitgen, F. T. Zentner, Jacob J. Stangel, Thomas Torrison, Fred Scheutte, Elias Gunnell, Joseph Koenig, Henry Wernecke, Julius Lindstedt, Charles Fechter, Charles Spindler, W. H. Murphy, John P. Reiss, Peter Reiss, J. A. Rummelle, Henry Ritts, and W. C. Dickie, all of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Jacob Dudenhoefer, Figgee Doyle Co., W. J. Armstrong Co., and Bishop Babcock Co., all of Milwaukee, Wis.,

protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Ernest G. Miller, G. P. Kissinger Co., Adam Billmaur & Co., and Lakeside Distilling Co., all of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY: Petition of Presbyterian Church of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Alice E. Wilson and Edward Losson, favoring passage of House bill 9814, relative to purchase of land granted to Oregon & California Railroad; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Quarter Century Society of Port of New York, favoring passage of House bill 9054, relative to sick leave of Government employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petitions of Michael L. Sutter and R. H. Ketcham, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, favoring appropriation for construction of Government railroad in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, favoring two new vessels for United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of E. T. Trotter & Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring tax on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, favoring appropriation for two new vessels in United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, favoring appropriation for construction of Government railroad in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of Pittsburgh-Hungarian Political Club, relative to preventing belligerents from interfering with the mails; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: Memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, relative to appropriation for carrying on Government railroad in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, favoring appropriation for two new vessels in United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers to accompany House bill 9734, for the relief of Hannah J. Stahl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSS: Petition of citizens of Winnetka, Ill., favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FREEMAN: Petitions of Boston Store and others, of Norwich; Ernest C. Morse and others, of Putnam; John C. Tracy and others, of Willimantic; N. A. Jordon and others, of Danielson; J. H. Bunce & Co. and others, of Middletown; E. B. Steele and others, of New London, all in the State of Connecticut, favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Holland Manufacturing Co., of Willimantic, Conn., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of United Spanish War Veterans, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of Pittsburgh Hungarian Political Club, of Pittsburgh, Pa., in favor of the United States providing mail facilities with all countries of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, in favor of an emergency appropriation for the Alaskan railroad; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, in favor of appropriations for the aid of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of Massachusetts rural letter carriers, that 24 miles constitute a standard rural route; that all miles over 24 miles be paid for at the same rate that is taken off for miles less than 24 miles; and that maintenance be allowed for all equip-

ment used on rural routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GLASS: Petition of business men of Roanoke, Va., in favor of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Papers to accompany House bill 10527, granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Pitner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of California, favoring censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Elizabeth Lowe Watson, of Cupertino, Cal., against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IGOE: Memorial of Kansas City (Mo.) Millers' Club, against the repeal of the mixed-flour law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Missouri Grain Dealers' Association, favoring passage of House bill 4646 for grading of grain; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 1,500 members of International Union of Brewery Workmen, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINKAID: Petitions of citizens of Cushing and Cotesfield, Howard County, Nebr., against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Memorial of Associated Chambers of Commerce of Pacific Coast, indorsing appropriation for United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, indorsing appropriation for railroad work in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of Woodside Methodist Episcopal Church, of Montgomery County, Md., favoring censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of W. J. Sanford and 33 other merchants of Big Rapids, Mich., against House bill 967—the Stephens bill—to prevent discrimination in prices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McLEMORE: Petitions of District Unions of Farmers' Educational Cooperative Union of Texas against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petitions of Sheet Metal Workers' Union, local No. 349; Building Trades Council; International Union of Steam Operating Engineers, local No. 315; International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers, local No. 276; Travelers' Protective Association; Tobacco Workers' International Union, local No. 1; Web Printing Pressmen's Union, No. 2; United Upholsterers' Union of St. Louis and Vicinity, local No. 21; Beer Drivers' and Stablenmen's Union, No. 43; International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablenmen, and Helpers, local No. 405; Switchmen's Union, lodge No. 54; International Moulders' Union, No. 59, all of St. Louis, Mo.; and a number of citizens of St. Louis and vicinity, praying for the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MOON: Papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Lewis A. Rominger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of W. T. Hornaday, in favor of the Hayden bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), memorial of Triangle Film Corporation, against the Hughes-Smith Federal motion-picture censorship bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also (by request), memorial of New York Zoological Society of New York, favoring converting any or all forest reserves into game refuges; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), petition of D. W. Northrup, secretary of Robert N. Basse Co., of Derby, Conn., indorsing the plans of the General Staff of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Horace A. Reeves, jr., of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of the Small pilotage bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NORTON: Resolution by the Minot (N. Dak.) Association of Commerce, protesting against the imposition of a Federal tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution adopted by the Sixth District Medical Society, Bismarck, N. Dak., favoring the making of adequate provision in the reorganization of the Army for a sufficient number of medical officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OAKEY: Petition of Rattan Manufacturing Co., of New Britain, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Petition of C. A. Smith and 28 others, of Baldwinsville, Mass., in favor of House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWE: Memorial of Travelers' Protective Association of America, in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Jessup & Moore Paper Co., of New York City, in favor of the Small pilotage bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the department of social betterment of the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Board of Charities, in favor of the Kern-McGillicuddy bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Edwin H. Burr, of New York City, protesting against any curtailment of mail deliveries in New York City; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Carroll Council, No. 321, Knights of Columbus, of Brooklyn, N. Y., in favor of making October 12, Columbus Day, a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCULLY: Memorial of Crystal Wave Council, No. 54, of North Long Branch, N. J., favoring the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of Freedom Council, No. 36, Daughters of Liberty, of Keyport, N. J., in favor of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of U. C. Rose, of South River, N. J., in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Associated Chamber of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, in favor of an appropriation to aid the Alaskan railroad; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, in favor of an appropriation to aid the Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Pittsburgh Hungarian Political Club, of Pittsburgh, Pa., in favor of the United States taking steps to secure mail service with all countries of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: Petitions of St. Marys Church and Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Storm Lake, Iowa, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of citizens of Gayly, Pa., favoring abolishing polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring Senate joint resolution 60, creating joint subcommittee to amend present interstate-commerce law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.